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1. INTRODUCTION

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada plays a unique role in the Las Vegas area, serving as both the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the transit authority responsible for providing public transportation in the region. As the MPO, RTC plays an important role in transportation planning by partnering with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), local governments, and transportation agencies to monitor growth and develop plans to address the immediate and long-range transportation needs of the region.

The RTC receives Federal funds both as a transit provider and as the MPO. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, requires that government, state, and local government agencies that are in receipt of Federal funds carry out their responsibilities and provide services in a manner that does not discriminate based on race, color, and national origin. Federal government funding agencies have the responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of Title VI are enforced.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the leading federal agency overseeing the RTC’s compliance with the requirements of Title VI. This report has been developed by the RTC in accordance with the provisions of Circular C4702.1B as they relate to the functions of the RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Southern Nevada.

In addition to the provisions of Title VI, federal funding agencies also monitor how the recipients of federal funds consider issues of environmental justice with regard to project planning, the siting and construction of facilities, and public involvement processes. Environmental justice is primarily the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.

Federal funding for transportation planning is administered by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), who has the prime responsibility for ensuring that local agencies and MPOs in Nevada receiving federal funds comply with Title VI. This report is therefore submitted to NDOT for incorporation into their Title VI report to FTA.
2. TITLE VI PROGRAM GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

2.1. Title VI Notice and Posting Locations

All vehicles owned and/or operated by the RTC are required to post Title VI notices with RTC contact information. These postings are also required by any contracted entity of the RTC including the fixed route and paratransit operating contractors, grant recipients, non-profit and for-profit organizations. The Title VI notice is also posted at the following RTC facility locations:

- RTC Administration Building
- Bonneville Transit Center
- Westcliff Transit Center and Park & Ride
- Centennial Hills Transit Center and Park & Ride
- South Strip Transfer Terminal
- Integrated Bus Maintenance Facility
- Sunset Maintenance Facility
- Mobility Training Center

Figure 2.1: Title VI Notice

---

**Title VI Policy**

*Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states*

“No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” The RTC is committed to complying with the requirements of Title VI in all of its federally funded programs and activities.

**Making a Title VI Complaint**

Any person who believes he or she has been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI may file a complaint with the RTC. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed with the RTC within 180 days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. For information on how to file a complaint, please contact Safety & Security Department, 600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 350, Las Vegas, NV 89106.

---

**Título VI Políticas**

*Según el Título VI de los Derechos Civiles de 1964 se exige que*

“Ninguna persona dentro de los Estados Unidos, en base a raza, color de la piel o país de origen deberá ser excluido de, o negados los beneficios de, o ser sujeto a discriminación, bajo cualquier programa o actividad en donde se reciba subvención del gobierno federal.” La Comisión Regional del Transporte de Sur de Nevada (RTC) se compromete a cumplir con los requisitos del Título VI en todos sus programas y actividades financiados por el gobierno federal.

**Remitir Una Queja del Título VI**

Cualquier persona quien considere que haya sido sujeto de discriminación puede presentar una queja por escrito ante el RTC. La queja debe ser remitida por escrito a RTC dentro de ciento ochenta (180) días posteriores al último supuesto incidente. Para información en como remitir una queja, por favor de contactar a: Safety & Security Department, 600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 350, Las Vegas, NV 89106.
2.2. Complaint Procedures and Form

Consistent with FTA Circular C4702.1B, the RTC has developed a procedure and form for Title VI complaints, which is provided in Appendix A. The procedures and forms are also available in English and Spanish at the following RTC webpage: rtsnv.com/about-the-rtc/legal-notices-title-vi/. Title VI complaints are administered by the Manager of Safety and Security Operations, who also serves as the agency’s Title VI Coordinator. See contact information below:

Judy Lopez
Manager of Safety and Security Operations
Regional Transportation Commission
702-676-1522

2.3. Title VI Investigations and Complaints

Table 2.1 summarizes Title VI transit complaints that occurred since the 2016 Title VI report (August 11, 2016 – April 17, 2019) and actions taken by the RTC to investigate and resolve them. According to RTC General Counsel, no Title VI lawsuits related to transit occurred during this timeframe.
Table 2.1: Title VI Complaints Summary for Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Incident Date</th>
<th>Complaint</th>
<th>RTC Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2016</td>
<td>8/2/2016</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that transit operator lowered ramp incorrectly, resulting in an unusable ramp due to the steep grade. Passenger claimed that transit operator stated that there was not time to wait and departed without boarding the passenger.</td>
<td>RTC investigated the claim and found that the transit operator was unable to allow the passenger to board safely without backing up. The RTC determined that a Title VI violation did not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2016</td>
<td>10/8/2016</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that transit operator did not allow boarding due to being Muslim and wearing a Niquab, a garment of clothing that covers the face.</td>
<td>RTC requested review by fixed-route bus contractor Keolis and if appropriate, take steps to revise training curriculum to address religious attire. The RTC was unable to identify that a Title VI violation occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2016</td>
<td>12/7/2016</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that a transit operator discriminated against him and two additional passengers due to being disabled.</td>
<td>RTC investigated the claim and based on information available, was unable to determine that a Title VI violation occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/2017</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that the transit operator motioned for him to walk further on the sidewalk reach the bus entrance door, and then would allow him to board.</td>
<td>RTC investigated and was unable to find a Title VI violation. A complaint was filed against the passenger for terrorist threats and harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2017</td>
<td>12/21/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that that the transit operator became belligerent towards her due to a verbal outburst by her 4-year old grandson, who has autism.</td>
<td>The RTC investigated and determined that a Title VI violation did not occur. The complaint was referred to the Department of Justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2017</td>
<td>2/21/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed she asked a transit operator for the #113 bus location, and the transit operator responded with a shoulder shrug and told her to catch the bus at another location. Passenger claims that the transit operator provided incorrect information.</td>
<td>The RTC informed the passenger that a Title VI violation did not occur since the complaint did not fall into one of the four categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2017</td>
<td>3/18/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that transit operator announced that bus was going out of service and an argument ensued. The operator provided the bus number and did not provide his badge number.</td>
<td>The RTC determined that a Title VI violation did not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Incident Date</td>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td>RTC Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/2017</td>
<td>3/25/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that the transit operator always arrived at the 219 bus stop (1:07 p.m. departure) at least 7-10 minutes late.</td>
<td>The RTC determined that a Title VI violation did not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/2017</td>
<td>3/28/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that the bus never arrives on time.</td>
<td>The RTC determined that a Title VI violation did not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that a person with a disability bumped into her foldable cart, which escalated into an argument. The transit operator yelled at the passenger and told her to get off the bus.</td>
<td>The RTC determined that a Title VI violation did not occur since the complaint did not fall into one of four categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2017</td>
<td>7/13/2017 &amp; 7/14 2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that a transit operator closed the bus door on him and his wife, and the operator indicated that he would not board people with disabilities.</td>
<td>Based on information gathered and an investigation, the RTC was unable to substantiate that a Title VI or ADA violation occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2017</td>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that she asked the transit operator to operator to notify her when bus arrives at her stop due to poor vision. Passenger claimed that the transit operator asked, “Are you blind or something?”</td>
<td>Based on video review, the RTC determined that an ADA violation did not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/2018</td>
<td>4/25/2018</td>
<td>Passenger claimed that the transit operator constantly “talks hypocrisy” and said negative words as she left the bus. Passenger also claimed that the transit operator allowed sleeping on the bus, and described her as a “maniac” to another passenger. Passenger indicated that she felt discriminated against due to gender and light skin color (race).</td>
<td>Based on video and audio investigation, the RTC is unable to substantiate that a Title VI violation occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/2019</td>
<td>10/25/2018</td>
<td>Passenger claimed officers discriminated and showed act of retaliation from a past event that occurred on the SDX bus. Passenger also claims that an officer labeled him as being homeless.</td>
<td>The RTC is currently investigating this complaint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. Public Participation Plan

The RTC Public Participation Plan (Appendix B) establishes committees, processes, and methods for engaging citizens, stakeholder groups, and other interested parties in transportation planning. The plan describes committees and working groups and public involvement required for MPO plans (i.e. Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program), transit plans (i.e. Coordinated Plan), and service changes (i.e. bus schedule).

Customized stakeholder outreach and communication plans are developed for each project in order to match goals and target audiences with engagement methods. The RTC uses many outreach channels and techniques, including:

- One-one-one meetings/interviews
- Elected briefings
- Stakeholder meetings and briefings
- Newsletters
- Media stories
- Printed materials
- RTC website
- Project microsites
- Social media – Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube
- Online surveys
- Facebook Live at public meetings
- Video production
- Public workshops
- Special events
- Focus groups
- Presentations at meetings of local partners
- Project advisory groups
- Pop-up workshops
- Special events
- Public information meetings
- Public hearings and comment periods
The Public Participation Plan, adopted in March 2015, will be updated during 2019-2020 to include additional online engagement tools, techniques identified in the RTC Southern Nevada Strong Community Engagement Toolkit (release date May 2019), and recommendations from the FHWA Environmental Justice Analysis in Transportation and Programming: State of the Practice (February 2019).

2.4.1. Outreach to Minority and LEP Populations

In all outreach efforts, special attention is placed on inclusiveness and emphasis on engaging minority and LEP populations. It is important to note that in all outreach efforts undertaken by the RTC are based on the following:

- MPO: For regional plans, all analyses for provisions for the minority and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) population are based on Clark County as a whole.
- Transit: All analyses for provisions for the minority and LEP population are based on service area.
The following methods are used for ongoing minority and LEP outreach efforts:

Invitations to Participate
For proposed transit changes and some MPO projects, collateral materials are distributed on transit vehicles and at transit shelters and facilities. Public meetings are promoted through social media, print media (i.e. Las Vegas Review Journal, The Sentinel Voice, El Mundo, Chinese Daily), and through news releases to local television, radio, and print media. Additionally, invitations may be sent through residential door hangers, direct mail, targeted email notification lists, distribution by partner organizations, and postings at community centers and libraries.

Convenient In-Person Input Opportunities
Public meetings are scheduled at locations and times that are convenient for surrounding residents, and held at ADA accessible facilities. Pop-up meetings with interactive outreach activities are often held in conjunction with existing community events. Project presentations are also made at existing meetings of minority and/or LEP focused organizations.

Online Engagement
Public meetings and workshops often include Facebook Live with Spanish captions or voiceover. Online surveys in Spanish and English have been used in many projects, reaching significantly more people than traditional in-person public meetings.

Language Services
RTC Transit print and audio messaging is provided in both Spanish and English. Assistance such as oral language translations, sign language service, foreign language service and resources, and document translation services is provided upon request for all public meetings. Additionally, the MPO provides Executive Summaries of document in Spanish and English and translation to other languages is available upon request. For additional available language services, see Section 2.5.2.

2.4.2. MPO Outreach Summary
Since the 2016 Title VI Report Update, the RTC MPO has continued to expand outreach activities with a focus on the engagement of minority and LEP populations, as summarized below:

Access 2040 (Regional Transportation Plan)
The MPO engaged in a continuous process of outreach associated with the development and adoption of the Access2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Public involvement anchored the development of Access2040, beginning with conducting an online vision survey that engaged nearly 7,000 people to identify transportation-related priorities. After the Plan was developed, the RTC conducted additional outreach during a 45-day public comment process, which included two pop-up meetings at community shopping malls, one pop-up meeting at the centrally located RTC Administration building, three local media articles, and five agency stakeholder meetings. At the conclusion of the public comment period, RTC staff responded to comments, which generated a range of changes and revisions to Access2040.
**Boulder Highway Multimodal Study**

The RTC worked with residents, business owners and community leaders to reimagine the transportation possibilities for Boulder Highway, where 10% of statewide pedestrian fatalities currently occur. The proposed Boulder Highway design concept, which includes transit, cycle tracks, and wide sidewalks, was developed through an extensive community engagement process. Outreach efforts included meetings of a technical advisory committee, two online surveys with over 3,000 total responses, intercept surveys at bus stops and community destinations (i.e. Boys and Girls Club, senior centers, special events), one-on-one meetings with key landowners, and the development of a bilingual project fact sheet.

**Bruce Street Green and Complete Street**

The Bruce Street Green and Complete Street study will facilitate multimodal connectivity between downtown North Las Vegas and downtown Las Vegas along the Bruce Street corridor. The study will include recommendations for complete street elements, pedestrian safety enhancements, and green infrastructure. Outreach currently underway includes a community survey, input from a Stakeholder Advisory Committee, key stakeholder interviews, and meetings located in close proximity to the Bruce Street Corridor.

**City of Henderson ADA Transition Plan**

The City of Henderson ADA Transition Plan developed a methodology to evaluate and prioritize universal design improvements related to transportation. A public outreach team was formed to develop and implement an outreach plan focused on engaging people with disabilities and other interested parties to identify barriers to accessible pedestrian facilities in the public rights-of-way, such as sidewalks, transit stops, and crosswalks in Henderson. Outreach included a web-based survey, resulting in input from 360 people, stakeholder group presentations, stakeholder interviews, and social media advertisements.

**City of North Las Vegas Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**

The City of North Las Vegas Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan will establish a comprehensive network of active transportation routes for non-motorized travel. The plan will increase mode share for bicycle and pedestrians as well as increase the level of comfort for these mode users. Outreach currently underway includes input from a Stakeholder Advisory Committee, an online survey, key stakeholder interviews, pop-up meetings, a project website, and social media posts.

**“On Board” Regional Mobility Plan**

On Board is the region’s comprehensive transit plan, which will identify how enhancements to the current bus system, new high capacity transit services, and emerging transit technologies can improve future mobility and accessibility. The first phase of the plan, which ended in December 2019, resulted in the following outreach accomplishments: 22,884 total surveys, 9,096 unique email contacts, 254 events, 109 presentations, and a total reach to more than 84,000 community members. As described in the On Board Engagement Report, minorities, people with disabilities, veterans, seniors, and low-income individuals were successfully reached through a robust community engagement effort.
Pedestrian Comfort Study
The Pedestrian Comfort Study and Demonstration Projects identified innovative strategies to address the challenges of the pedestrian environment in the Las Vegas Valley. The study also implemented temporary, low-cost demonstration projects at sites determined through equity mapping. Outreach included meetings of a Stakeholder Advisory Committee, two bilingual online surveys, social media engagement, a project webpage and branding, marketing through door hangers distributed in low-income neighborhoods, a focus group, and a youth workshop, which engaged over 2,300 people.

Spencer Greenway and UNLV Campus Bike Plan
Conceptual plans for a multi-use trail along an existing utility corridor and bicycle facilities at UNLV were developed through extensive community engagement. Outreach included input from a Stakeholder Advisory Committee, a project website, bilingual meetings and materials, two public meetings, a pop-up meeting at the UNLV Festival of Communities, and a bilingual online survey.

Tribal Consultations
RTC staff accompanies NDOT staff to tribal consultation meetings as needed. The Las Vegas and Moapa Paiutes have two reservations within Clark County: the Las Vegas Paiutes in the urbanized area and northwest and the Moapa Paiutes in the northeast. Both communities are planning residential, industrial, and/or tourism development on their lands and are interested in cooperating with NDOT and RTC to assure adequate transportation facilities are available.

2.4.3. Transit Outreach Summary
In order to keep transit riders informed of any fare or service changes proposed by the RTC, notices are prepared, translated in Spanish language, and posted in various ways to get the word out. Specific information related to all the various transit services provided by the RTC is also available on the RTC website at rtsnv.com/transit. Collateral is created for all public outreach to educate the public in regards to RTC services, programs, policies, and fare and service changes. The material is disseminated in various formats in English and Spanish.

RTC Transit
The various outreach mediums that are used by RTC Transit to reach out to the community as a whole are:

- Social Media: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and YouTube.
- Newspaper Ads: Las Vegas Review Journal (most popular local paper), Black Image (African-American publication), The Sentinel Voice (African-American publication), El Mundo (Spanish translated), El Tiempo (Spanish translated), Urban Voice (minority publication), and Chinese Daily (Chinese translated)
- Radio Ads: Broadcast all participating English and Spanish stations.
- Collateral is placed in the interior of all the transit vehicles that reach all customers across the Las Vegas Valley including the electronic multi-media on board (MMOB) system.
- Collateral is placed at transit shelters throughout the Las Vegas Valley.
- Ads are placed on the exterior of transit vehicles traveling throughout the Las Vegas Valley.
• Information is posted at all transit facilities and all RTC offices.
• RTC transit pass sales team disseminates information to customers.
• Transportation contractor holds staff meetings to let employees and drivers know of changes.
• Fliers are produced and disseminated to all transit vehicle drivers.
• Transit vehicle drivers disseminate fliers to customers.
• RTC conducts an “ALL HANDS” training session alerting all personnel of changes including appropriate contracted personnel, such as Fare Enforcement Officers.
• Fare Enforcement Officers disseminate fliers to customers.
• Customer Service on hold phone messaging informs customers of upcoming changes.
• RTC staff (street teams) is placed at affected areas promoting changes.
• Signs/decals are posted at transit stops and on ticket vending machines.
• E-mail blast is disseminated to appropriate rtcsnv.com subscribers.
• Information is highlighted in all agency Pocket Guides distributed for free to customers.
• Information is highlighted in all agency Transit Guides sold to customers.
• News releases are disseminated to local television, radio and print media.
• Information is distributed to major community employers.
• Audio recordings for on-hold messaging on customer service and administration phone queues
• Information is posted on the RTC website at rtcsnv.com.
• Homeowners Associations are notified via e-mail.
• Each local jurisdiction’s Neighborhood Services Department sends an e-blast to their perspective databases, as well as posting it within their respective facilities.
• Each local jurisdiction’s Business Development Office sends an e-blast to their perspective databases, as well as posting it within their respective facilities.
• Information is posted in libraries, community centers, and other community-gathering locales.
• Information workshops/transportation fairs are held at local libraries, community centers, malls, major employers, community events, neighborhood meetings, and other community-gathering places throughout the Las Vegas Valley.
• Club Ride (the agency’s Transportation Demand Management program) disseminates newsletters and e-blasts to its customers, as well as conducts weekly information workshops client offices.

RTC Paratransit
Paratransit specific program information is available at rtcsnv.com/transit/paratransit.
• Direct mail highlighting the proposed changes is sent to all Paratransit customers and guardians/personal care attendants.
• Newsletter article regarding the proposed changes is included in “Paratransitions” (newsletter disseminated to Paratransit customers).
• Customer Service on hold phone messaging informs Paratransit customers of upcoming changes.
• Collateral is created and placed in the interior of all the Paratransit vehicles.
• Paratransit Certification office disseminates fliers to potential and current Paratransit customers and their guardians/personal care attendants.
• Major Paratransit customer agencies and advocates disseminate fliers to current Paratransit customers and their guardians/personal care attendants.
• RTC Paratransit pass sales team disseminates information to customers.
• Information is highlighted in the agency Paratransit Riders’ Guides and Paratransit Eligibility brochure given to customers.
• Information is presented to the RTC’s Transportation Access Advisory Committee (TAAC) for public comment.

Recent Transit Service Changes
Since the 2016 Title VI Report, transit fares remained the same and three service changes occurred. Outreach related to recent service changes is summarized below:

Transit Route Changes (November 2016)
Changes included the launch of Route 122 (South Maryland Parkway / Horizon Ridge) and expanding operations of Route 105 (Martin Luther King) to 24 hours. Additionally, 14 routes increased service frequency, five routes were modified, and 10 routes provided earlier morning or later evening service. The ADA Paratransit Service Area also was adjusted to maintain the mandated three-quarters of a mile border on each side of the fixed route boundary.

Outreach efforts exceeded Public Participation Plan requirements. Information was provided on the RTC website, social media posts, and onboard the vehicles in the form of rider alerts and tear sheets. Staff collected comments through a formal 30-day public comment period that included two public meetings and resulted in 146 comments received. Staff made presentations to the RTC Board of Commissioners and committees (Executive Advisory Committee and Transportation Access Advisory Committee) and distributed a press release about the changes following Board approval. Staff also advertised at transit shelters and through digital marketing and targeted mailers to businesses and homes located a ½ mile along Route 122. The agency held a media event to announce the new route and service changes, with an advisory and post-event press release sent to media announcing free rides for the first week of Route 122.

Transit Route Change and Frequency Increases (December 2017)
Service changes focused primarily on frequency increases along already productive routes. Ten routes increased service frequency, and Route 105 experienced a routing change with a northeasterly extension, to serve a dense residential development and the largest retail area in the Las Vegas Valley that is currently unserved by transit. The ADA Paratransit Service Area also was adjusted to maintain the mandated three-quarters of a mile border on each side of the fixed route boundary.
Outreach included a public information session was held at the Bonneville Transit Center, followed by public meetings through the Transportation Access Advisory Committee and the RTC Board.

Transit Route Changes and Frequency Increases (December 2018)

Service changes focused primarily on frequency increases along already productive routes, to make transit service more convenient and appealing for customers. Frequency was increased on nine routes, and four routes experienced route changes. The ADA Paratransit Service Area also was adjusted to maintain the mandated three-quarters of a mile border on each side of the fixed route boundary.

Outreach included sharing information on the RTC website, through social media posts, and on board the vehicles in the form of tear sheets. Staff also conducted surveys and outreach to obtain customer input, and two public meetings were held (Transportation Access Advisory Committee and RTC Board).

2.5. Language Assistance Plan

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) requires that DOT recipients take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are Limited English Proficient (LEP). Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency,” reprinted at 65 FR 50121 (August 16, 2000), directs each Federal agency to examine the services it provides and to develop and implement a system by which LEP persons can meaningfully access those services. The Executive Order states that recipients must take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP persons.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq., and its implementing regulations provide that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance. The Supreme Court, in Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), interpreted Title VI regulations promulgated by the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to hold that Title VI prohibits conduct that has a disproportionate effect on LEP persons because such conduct constitutes national origin discrimination. Federal agencies also have published guidance for their respective recipients in order to assist them with their obligations to LEP persons under Title VI. This order applies to all state and local agencies that receive federal dollars.

The Language Assistance Plan is a key tool for RTC transit and transportation planning, as described below:

- **RTC Transit**: Public transit is a key means of achieving mobility for many LEP persons. Providing language assistance to persons with limited English proficiency is an effective way to ensure community outreach that helps identify the mobility needs of this population and any concerns or hardships they may be experiencing due to service or fare changes. An effective Language Assistance Plan demonstrates that the RTC values its customers who use the RTC’s fixed route bus services and ADA (American Disabilities Act) Paratransit Demand Response Services and is
committed to seeking community input in order to retain and improve the service the RTC offers to the community.

- **MPO**: The planning and programming decisions made by the MPO will affect the future economic health of the region and the transportation options available to residents. An effective LEP program is a tool to determine the extent to which the transportation needs of the LEP population mirror those of the community at large, and the extent to which LEP persons have different needs that should be addressed through the planning and project development process.

The Language Assistance Plan is based on the federal guidance provided by U.S. DOT. The plan evaluates language needs using the “four factor analysis”, identifies available language services, and establishes an implementation plan.

### 2.5.1. Determining Language Needs

In order to prepare the Language Assistance Plan (LAP), a needs assessment is conducted utilizing the Four Factor Analysis, as recommended by USDOT. The four factors are:

1. The number or proportion of limited English proficiency (LEP) persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by RTC services and programs.
2. The frequency with which LEP persons come into contact with RTC services and programs.
3. The nature and importance of the RTC’s services and programs in people’s lives.
4. The resources available to the RTC for LEP outreach, as well as, the costs associated with the outreach.

In the following analyses, each factor is considered in relation RTC Transit and RTC acting as the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

#### Factor 1: Number and Proportion of LEP Population

Individuals with limited English Limited English Proficiency are those who reported speaking English “less than very well” in the American Community Survey (ACS). RTC used data from the 2013-2017 ACS to determine the number of LEP persons over age 5 in Clark County. Key findings from ACS data are summarized below:

- 33% of the total population speak a language other than English at home. When comparing 2012 and 2017 ACS five-year estimates, Clark County experienced a 14% overall increase in the number of people that speak a language other than English at home, compared to a 9% increase in the overall population (Table 2.2).
- 13.5% of the total population have limited English proficiency and for Spanish and Asian/Pacific Island language groups, 40% of people have limited English proficiency (Table 2.3). The largest LEP language groups are Spanish and Tagalog (Table 2.4).
- 30.7% of the total population are Hispanic or Latino, 11.2% are Black of African American, and 9.6% are Asian (Table 2.5). Filipino residents make up more than half of the total Asian population at 53.4% (Table 2.6).
Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
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Safe Harbor Threshold

The Safe Harbor provision for written materials is triggered when an LEP population reaches 5% of 1,000 persons, whichever is less. According to Table 2.4, nine language groups meet this threshold. As shown in Section 2.5.2, the RTC provides written materials in Spanish, which is the largest LEP language group. For the second largest LEP language group, Tagalog, translation for written documents is not completed at this time since English is also an official language of the Philippines. The RTC offers translation into Tagalog or any other language upon request.

Table 2.2: Language Spoken at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken at Home</th>
<th>5-Year Percent Change in Number of People</th>
<th>2008 - 2012</th>
<th>2013 -2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Number of People</td>
<td>Percent of Total Pop.</td>
<td>Estimated Number of People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 5 years and over</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,815,331</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,218,087</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak a language other than English</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>597,244</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish or Spanish Creole</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>410,349</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>120,107</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19,314</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.3: Limited English Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken at Home</th>
<th>Total Number of Language Group that Speaks English “Less Than Very Well”</th>
<th>Percent of Language Group that Speaks English “Less Than Very Well”</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Population (ages 5+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish or Spanish Creole</td>
<td>188,391</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European languages</td>
<td>14,619</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>55,563</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>7,646</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Total Population (ages 5+) with Limited English Proficiency 13.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau – ACS 2013-2017 5-Year Estimates, Table C16001 – “Language Spoken at Home for Population 5 Years and Over”
### Table 2.4: Limited English Proficiency (detailed language list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>% Language Group with Limited English Proficiency</th>
<th>% Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1,976,398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>1,295,036</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>188,391</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Haitian, or Cajun:</td>
<td>6,802</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German or other West Germanic languages:</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian, Polish, or other Slavic languages:</td>
<td>13,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>4,568</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages:</td>
<td>25,489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>7,789</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean:</td>
<td>10,526</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese (incl. Mandarin, Cantonese):</strong></td>
<td>25,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>14,636</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese:</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tagalog (incl. Filipino):</strong></td>
<td>70,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>21,395</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian and Pacific Island languages:</td>
<td>24,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>9,838</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic:</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and unspecified languages:</td>
<td>17,588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau – ACS 2013-2017 5-Year Estimates, Table C16001 – “Language Spoken at Home for Population 5 Years and Over”
Table 2.5: Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>2,006,805</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,301,043</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>237,543</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>13,399</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>203,606</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30,768</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>108,668</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>13,035</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>10,388</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15,583</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>235,631</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>105,631</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>648,211</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,464,225</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>2,112,436</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau - ACS 2013-2017 5-Year Estimates, Table DP05 - “Demographic and Housing Estimates”

Table 2.6: Distribution within Asian population in Clark County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Percent of Asian Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>108,668</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese, except Taiwanese</td>
<td>29,932</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>13,035</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>10,388</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Asian</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>9,996</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203,606</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Frequency of Contact

Transit

Typically, the front line staff such as bus drivers, dispatchers, and call center staff are primarily in direct contact with customers and answer inquiries related to transit and paratransit services or activities. Currently, the most common request for translation is Spanish and translation services for other languages or services (i.e. sign language) are infrequent.

During October 2017, the RTC conducted the “Wave 9” customer satisfaction survey through on board surveys of 458 residents and 310 tourists. Demographic information for survey respondents follows:

- The income of most customers is below the average median income; 55% of customers surveyed have incomes under $25,000, 38% have incomes of $25,000 - $50,000, and 7% have incomes over $50,000.
- Race and ethnicity for survey participants includes Black/African-American (35%), Hispanic (30%), White (29%), Asian (4%), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (1%).

During November 2018, the RTC conducted the “Wave 11” Customer Satisfaction Survey, a statistically valid survey of 911 customers on board RTC fixed route buses. Responses included 649 resident surveys and 262 tourist surveys. Race and ethnicity for tourists participating in the survey follow: Spanish/Hispanic/Latino (29%), White/Caucasian (27%), Black/African American (24%), Asian/Pacific Islander (6%), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (1%).

Both surveys confirm that RTC transit has frequent contact with Hispanic customers, which represents the largest LEP language group (Spanish).

MPO

The MPO has contact with LEP individuals through community engagement related to transportation studies and plans including public workshops, special events, open houses, and online (i.e. social media, website). Each planning study includes the development of a community engagement strategy, where methods to reach LEP populations and translation/language assistance needs are identified based on the project-specific frequency of contact.

Additionally, the RTC conducts analyses to assess the potential impacts of regionally significant projects on minority, low income, and LEP populations.

Factor 3: Nature and Importance of Programs, Services and Activities

Transit

The RTC provides public transportation services to the general population through its fixed route bus service as well as some specialized transportation services that are based on demand response, such as the paratransit services for the seniors and people with disabilities. The RTC is always striving to provide the exceptional customer service to its riders. Therefore, it is important to the agency that language is not a barrier for the LEP customers while accessing any such transit or transportation services.
The RTC Transit Planning Department also conducts special analyses to assess those routes that operate in minority, low income, underserved, and LEP populations. The majority of RTC transit routes operate in areas where there is a significant LEP population. In addition, all transit routes operate at least partially in LEP populations due to the length of the route and the expanse of the service area.

**MPO**

The primary function of the MPO is to set out long-term regional transportation investment needs through the development and update of the 20-year Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan provides a framework for discussion of the importance of transportation to the regional economy, accessibility, mobility and safety. The RTP serves as a base for selecting projects to be implemented in the near-term using funding under federal transportation programs. These projects are identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The RTC also conducts planning studies that are funded under the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which includes multi-modal transportation studies, data collection and modeling, and intelligent transportation system planning. These studies often provide the basis for including projects in the RTP and TIP. Additionally, due to increasing numbers of pedestrian fatalities, car free households, and people with chronic diseases linked to a lack of physical activity, the RTC has expanded efforts related to active transportation planning. The RTC frequently conducts outreach and provides information to the community related to planning studies.

**Factor 4: Resources Available**

Each year, the RTC commits a considerable amount of funds and resources to provide for and improve access to its services and programs for traditionally underserved populations including LEP persons. The costs associated with customer services to the LEP population are part of RTC’s annual budget.

**2.5.2. Providing Language Assistance**

The RTC provides language assistance through the following methods:

**Bilingual Print and Digital Communications**

Currently, Spanish is the second most common language in Clark County and within the RTC transit service area; therefore, a number of materials are created and translated in a format that is easily understood by this Spanish speaking population.

Collateral are created and translated for outreach and marketing purposes, including:

- Direct mailings in English and Spanish
- Signs/decals posted at transit stops and on ticket vending machines
- E-mail blast disseminated to appropriate rtsnv.com subscribers
- Audio in English and Spanish for notices and key updates on RTC phone queue systems
- Information highlighted in all agency Pocket Guides distributed free to customers
- Information highlighted in all agency Transit Guides sold to customers
• News releases disseminated to local television, radio and print media
• Newsletters and e-blasts by Club Ride
• Spanish outreach materials (public notices, service explanations)
• English/Spanish on-board signage (how to use services, fares)
• English/Spanish brochures (i.e. fare box use, know your rights)
• Spanish route and time guides
• Spanish versions of key documents, such as Executive Summaries of planning documents

Multilingual Staff
The RTC Call Center also has two or more certified Spanish speakers available per work shift. Additionally, RTC Human Resources maintains a list of RTC staff who speak languages other than English at a conversational level or above. Staff with these skills provide language assistance to customers when needed, and are able to do so on short notice. As of April 2019, 123 RTC staff speak 26 different languages, including: Spanish (67), Tagalog (12), Chinese (5), German (5), French (4), Mandarin (3), Arabic (2), Asante (2), Ga (2), Italian (2), Russian (2), Akon (1), Bulgarian (1), Danish (1), Hawaiian (1), Hindi (1), Ilocano (1), Japanese (1), Korean (1), Punjabi (1), Shona (1), Sign Language (1), Swahili (1), Thai (1), Urdu (1), and Visayan (1).

Bilingual Public Meetings
Staffing at public meetings typically includes at least one staff person with conversational Spanish skills, and more bilingual resources are committed to meetings in areas known to have a high proportion of Spanish speakers. Facebook Live used during public meetings also provides Spanish captions.

Bilingual Bus Announcements
RTC bus audio systems provide transit information/announcements in both English and Spanish.

Sign Language and Braille
When additional language services are requested, outside contractors, such as American Sign Language Communication and Preston Bass, provide these services with training from RTC staff. Braille is also available from contractor Master Engravers upon request.

Website Translation
The RTC website is regularly updated to display the latest activities and the website allows for instant translation of the information posted in the following eight languages: Chinese, Dutch, French, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, and Swedish.

Additional Assistance
The RTC also offers additional language translation services for public meetings at no cost to the public, if the request is made 48 hours prior to the time of the scheduled meetings. MPO planning documents may also be translated into other languages upon request.
2.5.3. Plan Implementation

One of the main tasks for the RTC is to monitor the prioritization of transportation projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the changes to RTC Transit routes, fares and services. In particular, the RTC must analyze any major decision made to the overall transportation system, particularly if it negatively affects areas of high concentration of LEP population. On-going LAP implementation strategies include:

- Monitoring Language Needs
- Language Assistance Measures
- Staff Training
- Public Involvement
- Monitoring and Updating the LAP
- Point of Contact

Monitor Language Needs

The RTC will continue to monitor the language needs of the LEP individuals within its services area and will continue to do the following:

- Continue to monitor the languages and the customers’ needs encountered by the front-line staff.
- Continue to monitor the language preferences of the paratransit applicants.
- Continue to monitor the American Community Survey 1-Year Estimate published each year by the US Census Bureau for changes in the LEP population.
- Closely monitor the Census data and ensure that the Language Assistance Plan (LAP) is updated in a timely manner when the threshold population is reached in the Filipino community that is the fastest growing population in Southern Nevada besides the Hispanic population.

Language Assistance Measures

The RTC will continue to implement the current measures to assist the LEP population and will continue to enhance its services to strengthen the LAP to include:

- Continue to provide for interpreters as needed, in Spanish and any other language requested.
- Maintain regular communication with the drivers, dispatchers and other front line staff regarding their experience with the LEP clients in order to assess the assistance provided.
- Continue to translate important notices regarding fares, service changes, and major transportation planning studies or changes in policies that may directly or indirectly impact the LEP population.
- Continue to work with local social services agencies to disseminate information to the LEP population and to collect information regarding the unmet needs.
- Provide information related to available language translation in future MPO documents.
Staff Training
The RTC is going to ensure that staff is provided appropriate training in order to provide high level of customer service to the general population as well as the LEP population.

- All staff to be regularly trained for handling potential Title VI and LEP complaints.
- Staff with bilingual capabilities would be encouraged to work for the agency and will be given special training related to language assistance and how to handle potential Title VI and LEP complaints.
- Continue to survey staff for their language skills in order to provide conversation language assistance to RTC customers, as needed.

Public Involvement
The RTC will continue to implement its very extensive and inclusive public outreach process as has been detailed previously.

- Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the current process via feedback received from the public as well as certain targeted surveys.
- Update the Public Participation Plan as needed.
- Explore new and innovative techniques and strategies to engage the public in transportation planning.

Monitoring and Updating the LAP
The RTC will continue to update the LAP as required by the USDOT and as the characteristics of the population changes. Updates will be made as necessary and may include, but not limited to:

- Changes in LEP population by number or area as new information are made available.
- Updated analysis of the current LEP service area.
- Requirements for addition language translation services.
- Updates to policies and procedures, if such guidance is directed by the RTC Board.

Contact
Language assistance may be requested by contacting:

Regional Transportation Commission
Government Affairs, Media & Marketing
600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 350
Las Vegas, NV 89106
(702) 676-1500 (phone)
2.6. Boards and Committees

Membership of the Board of the RTC is defined in the Nevada Revised Statutes and is comprised of eight members designated by each of the local governments in the region, as well as the Director of the Nevada Department of Transportation serving in an ex-officio capacity. The composition of the Board is determined by the cumulative decisions of each of the member entities.

The Board is supported and advised by a number of Committees and Subcommittees. In most cases, the adopted RTC Policies and Procedures define the entities or agencies to be represented, leaving the membership to be designated by the specified entities and agencies.

There are three committees whose membership is at the discretion of the RTC: the Transportation Access Advisory Committee (TAAC), the Bus Shelter and Bench Advisory Committee (BSBAC), and the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee (TRAC). The purpose of each committee, membership broken down by race, and methods used to encourage minority participation are described below.

2.6.1. Transportation Access Advisory Committee

The RTC currently has the Transportation Access Advisory Committee (TAAC), a transit-related advisory committee that includes non-elected citizens. The TAAC provides public input on the transportation concerns and needs of seniors and people with disabilities pursuant to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The committee currently includes 11 members and the Policies and Procedures governing the membership of the TAAC state “the TAAC shall number no fewer than eight, nor more than 16 persons, each appointed by the RTC.”

Table 2.7: Transportation Access Advisory Committee Members (April 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and/or Ethnicity</th>
<th>TAAC Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process to Encourage Minority Participation

TAAC members include persons who are community advocates for seniors, people with disabilities, and citizens who use both fixed route service and paratransit service public transit. Interested persons submit applications to the RTC in order to be considered for TAAC membership. As part of this process, the RTC may mention availability on the Committee to elected officials of Clark County and local agencies, who may nominate a candidate who, in turn, applies. RTC personnel may recommend that an individual apply to participate on the Committee. Also, the RTC will periodically solicit membership applications in the event of vacancies.
2.6.2. Bus Shelter and Bench Advisory Committee

The 2005 session of the Nevada Legislature passed Assembly Bill 239, which transferred authority for bus stops from local governments to the RTC. AB 239 further required the establishment of an advisory committee to provide information and advice to the RTC concerning the construction and maintenance of those benches and shelters, thereby heightening Commission sensitivity to community needs and desires. The Policies and Procedures governing the membership of the Bus Shelter and Bench Advisory (BSBAC) reflect the requirements of AB 239 as follows: “Assembly Bill 239 mandates two members of the general public from each city within the county appointed by the governing body of that city and six members of the general public appointed by the Commission.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Bus Shelter &amp; Bench Advisory Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process to Encourage Minority Participation

When filling two vacant positions, RTC will make efforts to increase minority representation. RTC Government Affairs staff plans to distribute the vacancy announcement to an email group of African American, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific community leaders. RTC Government Affairs staff will also reach out to colleagues of under-represented communities seeking names of recommended committee applicants.

2.6.3. Transportation Resource Advisory Committee (TRAC)

To address technological transportation advancements as well as the region’s growing resident and tourism mobility demands, the RTC Board authorized staff to create the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee and Community Collaboration (TRAC) in September 2015.

TRAC consists of thoughtful leaders and committed citizens who represent large sectors impacted by transportation-related issues and are dedicated to transforming transportation in Southern Nevada and moving our community forward. TRAC consists of members who represent large groups of citizens impacted by transportation-related issues, including: home builders, resort/tourism industry, labor unions, engineering, real estate, medical, government, businesses, education, transit riders, cyclists, seniors, and non-profits. The RTC invited representatives from these sectors to participate on TRAC.
### Table 2.9: Transportation Resource Advisory Committee (April 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Transportation Resource Advisory Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process to Encourage Minority Participation**

When forming the committee, the RTC invited representatives from the Latin Chamber of Commerce and the Urban Chamber of Commerce, who were also involved in many other organizations that support minority communities. Ten of the 38 members are women, and one member represents seniors and individuals with disabilities.

### 2.7. Title VI Subrecipient Compliance

The RTC Transit Department is responsible for the administration of the Section 5310 program, which provides enhanced mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities. Section 5310 funds are utilized to purchase RTC Paratransit vehicles and federal funding does not pass through to subrecipients. The RTC utilizes local funding for projects of non-profit providers that serve transportation needs of senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and low-income residents through the Community Mobility Project. Although not required, the RTC holds grantees of the Community Mobility Project to established Title VI compliance, auditing and monitoring procedures.

Additionally, the RTC strongly encourages the following strategies that enhance service delivery for the transportation-disadvantaged population through the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Plan (Coordinated Plan): 1) enhance land use and transportation coordination, 2) promote enhanced pedestrian access to public transit and other modes of travel, 3) promote coordinated advocacy and improving efforts to coordinate funding with human service agencies, 4) improve inter-jurisdictional and intermodal travel, and 5) develop and implement mobility management approaches. An update to the 2016 Coordinated Plan is underway and will be completed by June 2020.

### 2.8. Title VI Equity Analysis for Construction of Facilities

No new facilities have been constructed since the 2016 Title VI Program Report. The RTC will conduct a thorough analysis of Environmental Justice (EJ) impacts within the surrounding area of any projects proposed in the future, including an analysis of facility siting.
3. REQUIREMENTS FOR FIXED ROUTE TRANSIT PROVIDERS

This Chapter covers the requirements that must be followed by Fixed Route Transit Provider that are subrecipients of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds. As with the general requirements discussed in Chapter 2, these transit requirements are set out in detail in FTA Circular C4702.1B of October, 2012.

3.1. System-Wide Service Standards

3.1.1. Vehicle Load Standards

The RTC pays special attention to over-crowding, and applies maximum occupancy standards (Table 3.1). Should these standards be exceeded routinely on one or more trips, that route becomes a candidate for frequency or vehicle capacity adjustments to reduce overcrowding and meet the standards shown in Table 3.1. Since the RTC operates a diverse fleet of vehicles, each vehicle type has its own maximum acceptable load, which is ascertained and maintained by the Service Planning group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Maximum Acceptable Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double-deck</td>
<td>80 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60’ Articulated (including “Streetcar” vehicles)</td>
<td>75 passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40’ Bus</td>
<td>45 passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there are slight variations in the number of seats between vehicles of the same type, RTC has chosen to use actual numbers of passengers as a standard, rather than load factors expressed as a percentage of seats available. Generally, vehicles with fewer seats than another vehicle of the same type are designed to accommodate more standees, meaning the overall acceptable capacity for the vehicles remain similar.

3.1.2. Vehicle Headway Standards

Given the realities of budget constraints, the RTC works with the following set of priorities and standards for service improvements. The RTC utilizes Boardings per Revenue Hour (B/RH) to evaluate the efficiency of RTC transit services. It measures the number of passenger boardings for each hour of revenue service provided. Four categories of B/RH standards are used based on route frequency. Each route is evaluated on an annual basis and if a route shows that it consistently meets the B/RH criteria for an upgrade that upgrade is prioritized for the next available service change,
subject to funding availability. As demonstrated in Section 2.4.3 (Transit Outreach Summary), the RTC has implemented a number of significant frequency increases on routes throughout the Las Vegas Valley in the past three years.

Table 3.2: Boardings per Revenue Hour (B/RH) Standards for Mature\(^1\) Fixed-Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Category</th>
<th>Boardings per Revenue Hour (B/RH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Minute Routes</td>
<td>15 to 25 B/RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Minute Routes</td>
<td>20 to 35 B/RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Minute Routes</td>
<td>30 to 45 B/RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Minute Routes</td>
<td>40+ B/RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.3. On-Time Performance Standards

On-Time Performance (OTP) is a critical measure of service reliability that customers experience directly. Customers expect that a bus will arrive at its scheduled time. When buses run late (or early), passengers are late to work or other appointments, causing significant hardship and perhaps resulting in lost patronage if the unreliability is chronic. OTP can often be improved by continuously allocating more running time, but this creates longer commutes for customers and makes transit less competitive with other modes. Additionally, increasing running time represents service hours that could be used elsewhere to increase frequencies, or add or extend routes.

In an attempt to balance these considerations, the RTC operates with the following OTP standards:

1. Ninety-five percent (95%) of all Vehicle Trips shall depart from the first timepoint of the Vehicle Trip with no greater deviation from the schedule than zero (0) minutes early departure and no more than two (2) minutes late departure;

2. Departures from ninety percent (90%) of all timepoints shall consist of no greater deviation from the schedule than zero (0) minutes early departure and no more than five (5) minutes late departure; and

3. Departures from ninety-five percent (95%) of all timepoints shall consist of no greater deviation from the schedule than zero (0) minutes early departure and no more than ten (10) minutes late departure.

\(^1\) Routes that have been operating for three years or longer are considered mature.
On-Time Performance is measured automatically using GPS, assessing the timeliness of all service operated and logged into the Automated Vehicle Locator (AVL) system.

OTP is affected by a number of factors that are addressed in differing ways, as shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Factors Affecting On-Time Performance and Mitigation Measures Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unanticipated Delays</td>
<td>Road construction, traffic accidents, detours, passenger incidents, breakdowns, police activity</td>
<td>Fill-in / “hot” coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Issues</td>
<td>Unusually slow operators, missed service (not due to Unanticipated Delays), abuse of recovery time</td>
<td>Operator retraining or discipline, increased contractor oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Running Time</td>
<td>Runs tend to start on-time but become consistently late – affects multiple operators, not caused by Unanticipated Delays or Operations Issues</td>
<td>Re-time trips / route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTP is monitored daily, but determinations regarding running time are based on at least one month of data. A route that is consistently performing below any of the three standards outlined above due to what has been determined to be insufficient running time shall be evaluated for retiming effective with the next scheduled service change.

3.1.4. Service Availability Standards

Local Routes (100, 200, and 300 series routes)

The standard or default bus stop spacing for local routes in the RTC Transit system is one-quarter mile. However, bus stop spacing varies due to a variety of site conditions. Distances ranging from 0.15 to 0.4 miles between individual stops are considered acceptable for local routes. While the exact distance between stops may be not 0.25 miles due to site conditions, local routes should generally average four stops per mile. There are also limited cases where it is acceptable to omit a one-quarter mile stop, including:

1. complete lack of accessible development
2. a freeway interchange or bridge
3. lack of a sidewalk or other safe access
4. any location where a stop cannot be safely located due to site conditions
Express Routes

*Freeway express routes:*

Freeway express routes feature stop spacing similar to local routes for short segments followed by long stretches, typically on freeways, between stops.

*Arterial express routes:*

In an effort to provide faster service, arterial express routes functioning as the only route on a corridor may feature stops up to approximately one-half mile apart on average.

### 3.2. System-Wide Service Policies

#### 3.2.1. Vehicle Assignments

Vehicle distribution to all routes is designed to ensure compliance with the Vehicle Load Standards outlined in Section 3.1.1. Capacity needs are evaluated by trip, with the trip requiring the highest capacity dictating the vehicle type assigned for each individual vehicle block.

The RTC has set an aggressive plan for replacing all vehicles. The RTC’s contractual agreement with its service providers requires that any vehicle be replaced within one year of reaching the Federal eligibility requirement of 12 years or 500,000 miles. These new vehicles are then placed into normal rotation and are deployed to a route after RTC Transit Operations Planning has completed reviewing the blocking requirements. As of June 2019, the average fleet age for all RTC Transit vehicles is 5.5 years.

#### 3.2.2. Transit Amenities

It is the goal of the RTC to install transit amenities at every stop where there is room to safely install a bus shelter and or bench. The RTC is currently underway on a capital program to achieve this goal and shelters are being installed at stops based on ridership and space availability. Some stops that do meet the requirement for an amenity are often met with challenges of obtaining right-of-way. In an instance where a shelter is warranted, but the right of way is not available, RTC will evaluate other options. Such options can include possibly relocating a stop slightly to a location where right of way is available, if such relocation would not significantly impact the bus stop spacing.

#### 3.2.3. Title VI Disparate Impact Policy

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) has established the Disparate Impact Policy in compliance with the applicable Federal requirements (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 49 CFR Section 21 and FTA Circular 4702.1B).

The FTA Circular 4702.1B requires that recipients of Federal Transit Administration funding prepare and submit service equity analyses for proposed major service changes or any fare change. The purpose of this policy is to establish a threshold which identifies when the adverse effects of a fare change or major service change, (defined as a 25% or greater) addition or reduction in service, are borne disproportionately by minority populations. The Disparate Impact threshold is defined as follows: Should the impact of any major service change require a minority population to bear...
adverse effects (20% more or less than those adverse effects borne by the non-minority population), that impact will be considered a disparate impact.

Should a proposed major service change result in disparate impact, RTC will consider modifying the proposed change to avoid, minimize or mitigate the disparate impact of the change. If RTC finds potential disparate impacts and then modifies the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential disparate impacts, RTC will reanalyze the proposed changes in order to determine whether the modification actually removed the potential disparate impacts of the changes.

### 3.2.4. Disproportionate Burden Policy

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) has established the Disproportionate Burden Policy in compliance with applicable Federal requirements (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 49 CVF Section 21 and FTA Circular 4702.1B).

The FTA Circular 4702.1B requires that recipients of Federal Transit Administration funding prepare and submit service equity analyses for proposed major service changes or any fare change. The purpose of this policy is to establish a threshold which identifies when the adverse effects of a fare change or major service change, defined as a 25% (or greater) addition or reductions in service, or construction projects, are borne disproportionately by low-income populations. For purposes of this policy, low-income population is defined as any readily identifiable group of households who are at or below 150% of the Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines.

The disproportionate burden threshold is described as follows: Should the burden of any major service change require a low-income population to bear adverse effects (20% more than those adverse effects borne by the non-low-income population), that impact will be considered a disproportionate burden.

Should a proposed major service change result in a disproportionate burden, RTC will consider modifying the proposed change to avoid, minimize or mitigate the disproportionate burden of the change. If RTC finds a potential disproportionate burden and then modifies the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential disparate impacts, RTC will reanalyze the proposed changes in order to determine whether the modifications actually removed the potential disproportionate burden of the changes.

### 3.3. Demographic Data

All but two RTC transit routes are designated as minority transit routes, based on the definition required by FTA Circular 4702.1B. The map below summarizes each route, the total route miles, route miles in minority population and the percentage of minority population. In addition, similar analysis was conducted for Low-Income populations and a map for that is included below. For minority transit routes, the agency will follow its established Disparate Impact Policy and for Low Income will follow the established Disproportionate Burden Policy.
Map 3.1: Transit and Minority Block Groups

ALL BUS ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Minority Miles</th>
<th>Minority %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- Minority Block Segment
- Minority Block Group
- Source: ACS 2009-2013 5-Year
3.4. Monitoring Transit Service

The Transit Planning department chose nine (9) routes for monitoring of service. The method used in order to adequately analyze the data was to compare the two non-minority routes in the system with seven minority routes. The determination whether a route was a minority route or not was based on the required definition of more than one-third of a route’s mileage being through or immediately adjacent to a Census block group with a higher than average percentage of minorities for the RTC Service Area. All non-minority routes were selected as there are so few, and seven minority routes (two north/south, three east/west, one radial, and one freeway express / limited stop) were chosen at random, utilizing a random number generator. The routes selected are:

Non-Minority Routes
- 217 – Warm Springs/Downtown Henderson
- HDX – Henderson & Downtown Express
Minority Routes
- 105 – Martin L. King
- 113 – N. Las Vegas Blvd.
- 203 – Spring Mtn. / Desert Inn / Lamb
- 209 – Vegas / Owens
- 212 – Sunset
- Deuce on the Strip
- CX – Centennial Express

3.4.1. Vehicle Loads
RTC monitors the vehicle loads of all trips on all routes using data gathered by Automated Passenger Counters (APCs) and assembled into a report. RTC reviews this report prior to each service change, making adjustments to service frequency or vehicle type assigned to ensure that capacity is not exceeded. Table 3.4 on the following pages provides the results of vehicle load monitoring for the sampled routes.

### Table 3.4: Vehicle Loads for Sampled Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route (percent minority)?</th>
<th>Avg. capacity per trip</th>
<th>Avg. peak load per trip</th>
<th>Greatest avg. peak load on a single trip</th>
<th>List of any individual trips where avg. peak load exceeds capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No (17%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>No (31%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority Category Average</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes (87%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes (78%)</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Yes (74%)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes (88%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Yes (54%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce*</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>18:32 NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Yes (57%)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Category Average (selected rtes)</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4: Vehicle Loads for Sampled Routes (continued)

#### Fridays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route (percent minority)?</th>
<th>Avg. capacity per trip</th>
<th>Avg. peak load per trip</th>
<th>Greatest avg. peak load on a single trip</th>
<th>List of any individual trips where avg. peak load exceeds capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deuce*</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>13:32 NB, 16:00 NB, 16:36 NB, 17:39 NB, 18:15 NB, 19:59 NB, 20:16 NB, 14:56 SB, 19:34 SB, 19:45 SB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Saturdays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route (percent minority)?</th>
<th>Avg. capacity per trip</th>
<th>Avg. peak load per trip</th>
<th>Greatest avg. peak load on a single trip</th>
<th>List of any individual trips where avg. peak load exceeds capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No (17%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>No (31%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority Category</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes (87%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes (78%)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Yes (74%)</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes (88%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Yes (54%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>12:31 NB, 13:07 NB, 14:01 NB, 14:41 NB, 15:21 NB, 17:10 NB, 20:44 NB, 23:12 NB, 15:00 SB, 15:09 SB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Yes (57%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Category</td>
<td>Average (selected rtes)</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4: Vehicle Loads for Sampled Routes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route (percent minority)?</th>
<th>Avg. capacity per trip</th>
<th>Avg. peak load per trip</th>
<th>Greatest avg. peak load on a single trip</th>
<th>List of any individual trips where avg. peak load exceeds capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No (17%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>No (31%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority Category Average</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes (87%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes (78%)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Yes (74%)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes (88%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Yes (54%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>13:13 NB, 14:49 NB, 15:00 NB, 15:54 NB, 16:45 NB, 18:26 NB, 20:51 NB, 14:31 SB, 16:37 SB, 17:54 SB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Yes (57%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Category Average (selected rtes)</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- Data reflects valid samples from March 10, 2019 through April 27, 2019
- Percentages in the “Minority Route” column reflect the percent of route miles in or immediately adjacent to minority Census block groups, where “minority” is defined as possessing a greater than average percentage of minority persons than the RTC Service Area as a whole.
- Average capacity shown represents the maximum acceptable load, as defined in Section 3.1.1, of the vehicle types scheduled to operate on each trip, averaged for all scheduled trips of the day.
- Greatest peak load on a single trip is based on a per trip average of the sample period.
- *Deuce is analyzed separately for Mondays through Thursdays (placed in the Weekdays chart) vs. Fridays. It is the only sampled route that operates separate schedules (due to different ridership & route timing needs) on Fridays vs. other weekdays.

**Assessment:** The loads of the two non-minority routes are generally lower than the seven minority routes, but with the exception of weekday daytime hours on Route 217, the frequency operated on those routes is already at a minimum. By contrast, the much larger cohort of minority routes experience a wide range of utilization. Six of the seven sampled minority routes experience average...
peak loads well below available capacity, with not even a single trip in the entire week exceeding capacity standards. Only one minority route – the Deuce – experiences vehicle loads in excess of RTC standards on some trips. This is due to the unique, volatile nature of the route & the corridor it operates on (the Las Vegas Strip). RTC will re-evaluate current ridership patterns again and ensure that sufficient capacity is scheduled beginning in March 2020.

3.4.2. Vehicle Headways

Table 3.5 below shows the average headway for various time periods of the sampled routes. The span of service, calculated based on the “Service Begins” and “Service Ends” times, is also provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route?</th>
<th>Service Begins</th>
<th>Average Headway</th>
<th>Span (Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No (17%)</td>
<td>4:13 AM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>No (31%)</td>
<td>4:29 AM</td>
<td>60***</td>
<td>11:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes (87%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes (78%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Yes (74%)</td>
<td>4:00 AM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes (88%)</td>
<td>5:08 AM</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10:28 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Yes (54%)</td>
<td>4:16 AM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Yes (57%)</td>
<td>5:22 AM</td>
<td>60***</td>
<td>12:03 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: Vehicle Headways & Spans of Service for Sampled Routes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route?</th>
<th>Service Begins</th>
<th>Average Headway</th>
<th>Service Ends</th>
<th>Span (Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overnight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Daytime</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 AM to 4:30 AM</td>
<td>5 AM to 6:30 PM</td>
<td>7 PM to 11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No (17%)</td>
<td>4:19 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>No (31%)</td>
<td>4:29 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes (87%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes (78%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Yes (74%)</td>
<td>4:11 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30/20**</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes (88%)</td>
<td>5:51 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Yes (54%)</td>
<td>4:22 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45/30**</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Yes (57%)</td>
<td>5:22 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sundays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Minority route?</th>
<th>Service Begins</th>
<th>Average Headway</th>
<th>Service Ends</th>
<th>Span (Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overnight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Daytime</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 AM to 4:30 AM</td>
<td>5 AM to 6:30 PM</td>
<td>7 PM to 11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No (17%)</td>
<td>4:19 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>No (31%)</td>
<td>4:29 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes (87%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes (78%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15/20****</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Yes (74%)</td>
<td>4:12 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Yes (88%)</td>
<td>5:51 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Yes (54%)</td>
<td>4:22 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45-40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Yes (35%)</td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Yes (57%)</td>
<td>5:22 AM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment: Overall, the vast majority of the RTC Transit Network, 37 out of 39 routes, qualify as minority routes. Three of the sampled routes, all of which are minority routes, offer 24-hour service. Of the six remaining non-24 hour routes, the span of service varies primarily based on demand & availability of nearby alternative service. With the exception of about one hour on Route 209, the sampled routes do not feature a significant span difference by day of week; all operate every day of the year. On average, sampled minority routes operate a greater span of service than non-minority routes. As shown, routes that operate more frequently throughout the day also tend to operate a longer span of service than lower frequency routes. This is partly a function of efficiency; more frequent routes can scale down service when demand scales down, whereas routes already operating at a minimal frequency during peak hours cannot be feasibly reduced further. Many routes operate somewhat less frequently on Saturdays & Sundays, but this is typical, and does not demonstrate a difference in sampled minority vs. non-minority routes.

3.4.3. On Time Performance

RTC measures on-time performance as explained in Section 3.1.3. Table 3.6 summarizes the on-time performance for minority and non-minority sampled routes. The Deuce is not measured using traditional on-time performance, as it operates along the highly variable, iconic Las Vegas Strip corridor, where headway consistency rather than on-time performance is valued. Overall, of the eight routes analyzed, three met the five-minute standard, while five did not. Conversely, five of the eight routes met the ten-minute standard, while three did not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Route 203 on Saturdays operates every 30 minutes from approx. 5 AM to noon, then increases to every 20 minutes for afternoon hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Route 212 on Saturdays operates every 40-45 minutes during morning hours, then increases to every 30 minutes for afternoon hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***CX &amp; HDX operate mostly hourly service during these hours, with a few additional trips providing short bursts of 30 minute frequency during traditional commute hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****Route 113 on Sundays operates every 20 minutes until approx. 8:30 AM, then increases to every 15 minutes for the rest of daytime hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assessment:** The sampled minority routes operated with somewhat better on-time performance than the two non-minority routes according to the five-minute standard and nearly identical performance in the ten-minute standard. On-time performance of two (CX & HDX) of the three routes that failed to meet the ten-minute standard was heavily impacted by additional congestion associated with major freeway construction projects, which will be concluding in 2019. The reasons behind Route 203 failing to meet standards are not immediately clear; route length may be a contributing factor, or additional operational oversight may be needed. This will be watched for improvements going forward. Changes were enacted in part to improve on-time performance on Route 209 in Dec. 2018, which were mostly not reflected in the calendar year sample period.

### Table 3.6: 2018 Overall On-Time Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>% On-time 5 minute standard</th>
<th>Five minute standard met?</th>
<th>% On-time 10 minute standard</th>
<th>Ten minute standard met?</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Minority Category Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.6%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>95.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority Category Average (selected rtes)</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>95.5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.4. Service Availability for Minority and Non-Minority Residents

The availability of bus stops relating to a specific route is determined by route classification, with bus stops placed in accordance with Section 3.1.4.

Map 3.3 below summarizes the service availability for the selected routes in minority and non-minority tracts. Total and minority populations are calculated within ¼ and ½ miles of bus stops.

Map 3.3: Transit and the Minority Population
3.4.5. Vehicle Assignment

The chart below depicts the average fleet age for the RTC fixed-route transit vehicles, as of June 2019, based on year of production (rounded to nearest year). The average fleet age for all RTC fixed-route transit vehicles is 5.5 years.

### Table 3.7: Age of the RTC Fixed-Route Transit Fleet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Number of Vehicles</th>
<th>Avg. Age (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40' CNG (SMF)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60' CNG (SMF)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-Deck (SMF)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar (SMF)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.8: Vehicle Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rte.</th>
<th>Most Common</th>
<th>2nd Most Common</th>
<th>Average Age of Vehicles Used on Rte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Type</td>
<td>% of Trips</td>
<td>Age of Veh. Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>40' CNG (SMF)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDX</td>
<td>40' CNG (SMF)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Minority Category Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rte.</th>
<th>Most Common</th>
<th>2nd Most Common</th>
<th>Average Age of Vehicles Used on Rte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>40' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>60' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>60' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>40' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>40' CNG (SMF)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuce</td>
<td>Double-Deck (SMF)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>40' CNG (IBMF)</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minority Category Average** (selected rtes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rte.</th>
<th>Most Common</th>
<th>2nd Most Common</th>
<th>Average Age of Vehicles Used on Rte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Assessment:** The average age of vehicles used on the seven sampled minority routes is twice that of the non-minority routes. However, this is because both category averages are well below the average lifespan of a fixed-route bus. At an average of 4.2 years, the age of vehicles used on minority routes is young relative to a typical lifespan. Still, the Deuce route operating double-deck buses that are 12 years old, at the end of their useful life, is heavily skewing the minority category average. These buses are planned for replacement in the next two years, at which time the route will operate with an average vehicle age that is among RTC’s youngest.
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Title VI
Complaint Procedures

This document outlines the Title VI complaint procedures related to providing programs, services, and benefits. However, it does not deny the complainant the right to file formal complaints with the Nevada Department of Transportation, the Secretary of the US Department of Transportation, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), or to seek private counsel for complaints alleging discrimination, intimidation or retaliation of any kind that is prohibited by law.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that no person in the United States, on the grounds of race, color or national origin be excluded from, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination, under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Procedure

1. Any person who believes that they have been subjected to discrimination may file a written complaint with the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. Federal and State law requires complaints be filed within one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days of the last alleged incident.

2. The complainant may download the complaint form from rtcsnv.com or request the complaint form from the Safety & Security Department. The complainant may also submit a written statement that contains all of the information identified in Section 3 a through f below.

3. The complaint will include the following information:
   a. Name, address, and telephone number of the complainant.
   b. The basis of the complaint; i.e., race, color, national origin, or Limited English Proficiency.
   c. The date or dates on which the alleged discriminatory event or events occurred.
   d. The nature of the incident that led the complainant to feel discrimination was a factor.
   e. Names, addresses and telephone numbers of persons who may have knowledge of the event.
   f. Other agencies or courts where complaint may have been filed and a contact name.
   g. Complainant’s signature and date.
   h. If the complainant is unable to write a complaint, Customer Service staff will assist the complainant. If requested by complainant, Customer Service will provide a language or sign interpreter.
   i. The complaint may be sent or faxed to the following address:
      RTC – Safety & Security
      600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 350
      Las Vegas, NV 89106
j. The complaint may be sent via email to rtcsafetysecurity@rtcsnv.com.
k. Complainants have the right to complain directly to the appropriate federal agency however, they must do so within one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days of the last alleged incident.

4. The RTC will begin an investigation within fifteen (15) working days of receipt of a complaint.

5. The RTC will contact the complainant in writing no later than thirty (30) working days after receipt of complaint for additional information, if needed to investigate the complaint. If the complainant fails to provide the requested information in a timely basis, the RTC may administratively close the complaint.

6. The RTC will complete the investigation within ninety (90) days of receipt of the complaint. A written investigation report will be prepared by the investigator. The report shall include a summary description of the incident, findings and recommendations for disposition.

7. The RTC’s Customer Service Manager will review the report. A closing letter and exit interview will be provided to the complainant. The respondent will also receive a copy of the closing letter. Each will have five (5) working days from receipt of the report to respond. If either party responds negatively or has additional information to provide, an informal meeting will be arranged by the Customer Service Manager. If neither party responds, the complaint will be closed.

8. The investigation report with recommendations and corrective actions taken will be forwarded to the appropriate federal agency, the complainant and the respondent.

9. The RTC will advise complainants of their appeal rights to the appropriate federal agency.
Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Title VI Complaint Form

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Please provide the following information necessary in order to process your complaint. Assistance is available upon request. You may contact RTC to receive communication in an alternate format. Complete this form and mail or deliver to: RTC – Safety and Security, 600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 350, Las Vegas, NV 89106. Contact the RTC via phone at (702) 676-1592 or via email at rtcsafetysecurity@rtcsnv.com.

1. Complainant’s Name:_______________________________________

2. Address:_________________________________________________

3. City:_____________________ State: _____ Zip Code:____________

4. Telephone No. (Home): ______________(Business):______________

5. Person discriminated against (if other than complainant)

   Name:_____________________________________________________

   Address:___________________________________________________

   City: ________________________State:_____ Zip Code:____________

6. What was the discrimination based on? (Check all that apply):  

   __________Race
   __________Color
   __________National Origin
   __________Limited English Proficiency

7. Date of incident resulting in discrimination:______________________

8. Describe how you were discriminated against. What happened and who was responsible? For additional space, attach additional sheets of paper or use back of form.
9. Did you file this complaint with another federal, state, or local agency; or with a federal or state court? (Check appropriate space) Yes____ No_______

If answer is yes, check each agency complaint was filed with:

Federal Agency_______  Federal Court _______  State Agency_______
State Court _______  Local Agency _______  Other_______

10. Provide contact person information for the agency you also filed the complaint with:

Name:__________________________________________________________
Address:________________________________________________________
City: ______________________ State: _____  Zip Code:_________________
Date Filed:___________________

11. Sign the complaint in space below. Attach any documents you believe supports your complaint.

Complainant's Signature ___________________ Signature Date ____________
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN
Executive Summary

The RTC and the MPO

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) is both the transit authority and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Southern Nevada. The MPO oversees the federally mandated transportation planning process for Southern Nevada and plans the valley’s roadways and transit infrastructure to accommodate the demands of the region’s current population in addition to the growing population 20 years from now. Included in the MPO planning process are projects that require state and federal funding. Additionally, the RTC also manages distribution of funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Federal Highway Trust Fund, the County Option Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax for regional, street and highway construction and county sales tax designated for transportation.

The RTC provides mass transit that connects throughout Southern Nevada and administers programs that encourage sustainability, such as Club Ride Commuter Services that promotes walking, biking, carpooling, vanpooling and taking transit to and from work and/or school. RTC Transit operates 39 transit routes, including two routes that serve the Resort Corridor on the Las Vegas Strip, four Commuter Express Routes and four Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Routes. The RTC also operates three park and ride facilities as well as partners with private businesses and casinos to establish additional park and ride lots. The RTC also operates an extensive complimentary paratransit system within the RTC Transit service area to those that cannot access RTC Transit bus stops.

Other Senior Transportation services such as Flexible Demand Response and Silver Star are offered primarily to senior citizens who need access to shopping and medical facilities near their residences. The RTC operates four transit centers spread across the Valley that allows multiple routes to converge for easier transferring to continue across the Valley. Three of these transit centers have parking spaces available for travel on RTC buses.

As the Las Vegas Valley’s population continues to increase daily, so does traffic congestion. The RTC identifies transportation challenges and explores and implements both short and long-term resolutions while simultaneously promoting sustainability, air quality improvement, enhanced mobility and increased quality of life in the region. Each of these processes involves plans and projects that not only require, but are enhanced by public participation.
1 The Public Participation Plan

The Public Participation Plan (PPP) is intended to promote the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) transportation planning process by defining a method that provides citizens, stakeholder groups, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to provide meaningful input during the transportation planning process especially at key decision points.

RTC Policy for Public Involvement: RTCSNV realizes that public involvement is critical to the successful development and implementation of any transportation plan. The principal objectives of the Public Participation Plan are consistent with the requirements outlined in 23 CFR 450.316 and include:

- To offer early and continuous opportunities for the public to be involved in the identification of social, economic, and environmental impacts of proposed transportation decision.
- To seek out and consider the viewpoints of minority, low-income, and limited English proficiency (LEP) populations (as well as older adults and people with limited mobility) in the course of conducting public outreach activities.
- To provide timely information about transportation issues and processes to all interested parties.
- To establish a consistent means of notification and involvement for the public.
- To utilize public involvement in the development of transportation plans, programs, and projects which represent identified local, regional, and state priorities and needs pertaining to multiple modes of transportation.
- To develop a public participation plan in consultation with interested parties and to update periodically as deemed necessary.
- To coordinate the MPO’s PPP with statewide public participation plans to enhance public consideration and understanding of the area’s transportation issues, plans, and programs.
- To evaluate, on a periodic basis, the MPO’s PPP to verify that the process is open to all individuals with interest and the procedures of the policy are being implemented and followed in accordance with federal regulation and the objectives set forth herein are administered appropriately by the MPO.

2 Planning Process and Need for Public Involvement

The metropolitan transportation planning process is a proactive public involvement process that provides the public access to important information that can be utilized to make decisions about investments that will impact transportation infrastructure in Southern Nevada. Public involvement is necessary because it is the public’s opportunity to provide perspective on the transportation issues that matter to them, whether it is congestion on their commute to work or lack of sidewalks in their neighborhood. Furthermore it is a two-way process that improves decision making and gives the community ownership of the resulting plans and recommendations.

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) requires that MPOs develop a Public Participation Plan “developed in consultation with all interested parties.” MAP-21 defines "Interested Parties" as:
• Citizens
• Affected public agencies
• Representatives of Public Transportation Employees
• Freight Shippers
• Private [including Non-Profit] Providers of Transportation
• Representatives of Users of Public Transportation
• Representatives of Users of Pedestrian Walkways and Bicycle Transportation Facilities
• Representatives of the Disabled
• Providers of Freight Transportation Services
• Other Interested Parties

**Why Should the Public Get Involved**

The RTC values public participation to help inform transportation decisions. The following are some reasons for the public to get involved to shape the transportation system in Southern Nevada.

a) Every household and business depends on safe transportation infrastructure to move both people and goods. Consider all the modes of transportation you and your family take each day—walking, biking, driving a vehicle or taking the bus. The RTC is involved in the planning and construction of facilities to improve transportation in southern Nevada. Improved infrastructure and transit service means more mobility and transportation options for you and your family.

b) Southern Nevada’s mobility, quality of life, economic growth and competitiveness rely on the multi-modal transportation network.

c) The funding to build and maintain our transportation system comes from several sources including your tax dollars.

**Figure 2- Neighborhood Public Meeting to Improve Transportation Safety**

---

**3 Regulations and Requirements**

RTC developed this PPP in consultation with the public as defined in this document. The RTC PPP describes the federal and state regulations that the agency is required to follow. Also included in the PPP are the RTC’s policies and procedures for conducting public outreach, scheduling public meetings, and incorporating public input into the transportation planning process. The PPP is consistent with 23 USC 134 and 23 CFR 450 and the following regulations and laws.
Title VI

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color, and natural origin in programs and activities that receive federal financial assistance. Most funding agencies, including the RTC, have regulations implementing Title VI that prohibit recipient practices that have the effect of discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Executive Order #122898 (Environmental Justice)

In February 1994, President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order #12898 – Executive Order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. The order is intended to focus federal attention on the environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice. Environmental justice is achieved through promoting nondiscrimination in federal programs substantially affecting human health and the environment, and providing minority and low-income communities access to public information, and an opportunity for public participation in matters relating to human health and the environment.

Open Meeting Law

The Nevada Open Meeting Law (OML), found in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS Chapter 241), was enacted in 1960 and significantly revised in 2011 to ensure that the actions and deliberations of public bodies be conducted openly. The OML applies to most RTC actions, though closed meetings are permitted under certain circumstances. Where OML applies, the RTC keeps minutes as public records. These minutes indicate the date, time, members present and actions taken during the meeting. Staff may keep additional records from meetings that are also public record. For additional information of the OML please refer to the Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual, Eleventh Edition.

Public Records Law

The Nevada Public Records Law is found in NRS Chapter 239. Nevada’s Public Records Law was enacted to ensure that government documents are available to the public and applies to most RTC actions. There are exceptions to Nevada’s Public Records law, as described in NRS Chapter 239.

RTC public records are available by filling out the RTC Public Records Request Form. The form is available on the RTC website and is included as an appendix to the PPP. E-mail the completed form to publicrecordsrequest@rtcsnv.com or fax the completed form to (702) 676-1519. Once the request has been submitted you will be contacted by a RTC representative to process your application. There are fees associated with copying RTC public records and documents, however; in consideration of sustainability, documents which can be successfully e-mailed or faxed will be provided at no charge.

Accommodations

The RTC schedules public input meetings at convenient and accessible locations, and at times and facilities compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The RTC sends notices to both English and Spanish publications and the RTC website is translatable into 13 languages. The RTC will make reasonable accommodations to those
with additional special needs who wish to participate in the planning process.

**Complaint Procedures**

Any person who believes he or she has been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI may file a complaint with the RTC. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed with the RTC within 180 days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. For information on how to file a complaint, please contact the RTC at:

RTC Customer Service Manager  
600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 350  
Las Vegas, NV 89106  
(702) 228-4800

The official complaint form is also available in English and Spanish on the RTC website.


**Record Keeping Procedures**

All RTC record keeping procedures are in accordance with Federal and State Law.

In reference to Title VI complaints the RTC keeps and maintains a record of all complaints and their disposition for period of no less than seven years.

4 **RTC Committees**

Each of the committees and working groups listed in the table below are publically noticed and open to public participation. While the committees or working groups may not take action on any item not on the agenda the public may raise issues during the citizen participation period. Issues raised in this manner may be placed on a succeeding agenda.

It is also noted that topical work groups and ad hoc committees are established on a project specific basis. Such groups meet for a limited period of time to address specific issues of a particular project or plan. These groups may be managed by the RTC or by other participating agencies. The number of meetings, group composition, and extent of public involvement is situational and depends on the magnitude of the issue. Figure -3 shows organizational structure of the RTC Committees.
Figure 3 - RTC Organizational Structure
RTC Committee structure and details are currently as follows:

**Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada**

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) is comprised of elected officials from RTC member governments as follows: Two elected officials from Clark County, two elected officials from the City of Las Vegas, one elected official from each remaining jurisdiction, and the Director of the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) in a non-voting capacity.

RTC Board meetings are typically held in the Commission Chambers of the Clark County Government Center, located at 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., on the second Thursday of each month at 8:45 a.m.

**Transportation Access Advisory Committee**

The Transportation Access Advisory Committee (TAAC) is an advisory committee comprised of staff from applicable agencies and members of the general public. Each RTC Commissioner may appoint one member, additional members are appointed in an at-large capacity.

The TAAC provides public input on all transportation concerns, including the needs of the elderly and disabled members of the community, as they relate to the business matters being brought forward for approval to the Regional Transportation Commission’s Board. TAAC serves as the RTC’s Paratransit Consumer Advisory Committee as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. TAAC meetings are held the Wednesday before the last Thursday every other month at 1:30 p.m. in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

**Finance Committee**

The Finance Committee is comprised of four Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) Commissioners who provide recommendations regarding the agency’s budgetary and financial issues. The committee meets on an as-needed basis in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

**Executive Advisory Committee**

The Executive Advisory Committee (EAC) consists of management and department director level employees from RTC member government planning and public works departments. The EAC responsibilities include the formulation of recommendations to the Commission on all non-personnel related administrative, planning, technical, transit, street and highway funding, operational matters, and other items as requested by the Commission. The EAC meets the last Thursday of each month at 9:15 a.m. in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

**Operations Subcommittee**

The Operations Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the EAC. Membership is comprised of traffic engineers and members of the law enforcement community, and Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation (FAST).

The subcommittee assists the EAC by considering traffic management and roadway operations and making recommendations. This subcommittee meets the Tuesday of the week prior to the EAC, during the odd-numbered months, at 1:30 p.m., in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.
Specifications Subcommittee

Comprised of RTC member government public works directors, the Specifications Subcommittee assists the EAC in focusing on matters regarding the Uniform Standards Specifications for Public Works Construction Offsite Improvements and updating the Uniform Standard Drawings. This subcommittee meets on the 2nd Wednesday of the even-numbered months at 1:30 p.m. in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee

The Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee (MPS) consists of senior staff level employees from each of the RTC member governments and other agencies from relevant industries, such as freight, as appropriate. The MPS assists the EAC in the formulation of recommendations to the RTC.

The subcommittee considers transportation planning and programming issues that require more investigation and analysis. MPS generally meets on the second Tuesday of the odd-numbered months in Room 296 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

FAST Operations Management Committee

The FAST Operations Management Committee (OMC) is made up of transportation engineers and law enforcement officials and recommends policy, establishes operational procedures and principles, and monitors the day-to-day operations of the system. FAST includes the intelligent transportation system field devices and traffic signals, central system software and hardware, operator work stations, video wall, and communications systems including the fiber optic and microwave network. The OMC meets on the first Thursday of each month at 9:30 a.m. in Room A105 of the Transportation Management Center unless otherwise posted.

Utility Coordination Committee

The Utility Coordination Committee (UCC) includes members from each RTC member agency as well as a member from each Valley utility. The UCC assists member entities in coordinating utility activities. It meets regularly to coordinate the construction of infrastructure improvements to reduce inconvenience and delays to the public. The committee meets on the third Wednesday of the month at 9 a.m. in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

Bus Shelter/Bench Advisory Committee

On July 1, 2005, the State of Nevada Legislature approved Assembly Bill 239, amending Chapter 373 of Nevada Revised Statues transferring the authority to provide for benches and shelters for passengers of public mass transportation from local governments to the RTC. Pursuant to the Bill, an Advisory Committee was required in order to gather input and make recommendations on issues related to bus shelters and benches located within the Las Vegas Valley.

The committee is made up of an appointee from each RTC member entity served by transit, Nellis Air Force Base, UNLV, and members of the Attorney General's office, and the law enforcement community.
BSBAC meetings are held on the even-numbered months on the third Thursday at 3:00 p.m. in Room 108 of the RTC Administrative Building, unless otherwise posted.

**Arts in Transit Advisory Council**

The Arts in Transit Advisory Council is made up of members representing a variety of art-related stakeholder groups. Their expertise and knowledge provides recommendations on artwork that will be placed throughout Southern Nevada's transit system as the RTC moves forward with its commitment to enhancing Southern Nevada's transit system. The Council will meet at least quarterly or more often as determined by the RTC. Please note that the meeting days and times may vary. These meetings are open to the public and agendas are available on the RTC website.

**Conformity Working Group (CWG)**

RTC follows all consultation procedures specified in the Clark County Transportation Conformity Plan. RTC, as the Lead Agency in the CWG, conducts quarterly CWG meetings to discuss and review drafts of the RTP, TIP, RTP and TIP conformity analysis, conformity analysis, Air Quality Implementation Plan, and Transportation Control Measure Plan for inclusion into the SIP and related air quality model activities required under 40 CFR §93.105 and determining conformity of federal actions to state or federal air quality implementation plans; specifically, exempt projects (40 CFR §93.126 and §93.127). The DAQEM is the lead agency to develop the SIP and provide notification of SIP findings. The CWG is comprised of the local and state air quality agencies, Nevada Department of Transportation, Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, and local governments. Meeting notices are sent out by the RTC staff in advance to the agencies involved.

The RTC follows all respective roles and responsibilities for air quality-related transportation planning activities specified in the Clark County Transportation Conformity Plan. The interagency consultation process requires agency procedures that detail how an agency shall make conformity determinations, develop transportation plans, the TIP and SIP. Through interagency consultations and regular meetings with other governmental agencies the RTC requests the member cities and all other Clark County agencies to submit candidates’ projects and programs for inclusion in the draft; and provide consultation on the draft, the environmental impact report and amendments.

**Land-Use Working Group (LUWG)**

The Land Use Working Group (LUWG) consists of land-use planners and professionals from multiple local entities. The RTC works in a cooperative process and develops consistent land use, population and employment forecasts which will be approved by the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) and the RTC and then be used as the input for Travel Demand Model for the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The LUWG group meets quarterly at the time of RTP development. The land-use and air quality results and process are documented in the RTP and TIP documents which are subject to public review and comment.

### 5 MPO Planning Documents

The Public Participation Plan (PPP) outlines the procedures for ensuring public involvement in the development of the
transportation planning documents produced by the MPO. Under these procedures, the update and revision of the PPP require public notice, a 45-day public review and comment period, and at least one public meeting during the development process.

The **Regional Transportation Plan** (RTP) is a 20-year plan that describes the projected transportation needs in the region and outlines the strategic investments in transportation planned to be made within the expected resources available.

The **Transportation Improvement Program** (TIP) is a detailed listing of roadway and transit projects that are taken from the RTP and are expected to receive federal funding over the next four years. The TIP for Southern Nevada is usually updated every two years and amended or modified more frequently as needed.

The **Unified Planning Work Program** (UPWP) is updated every year to list transportation planning activities in Southern Nevada. The area agencies are informed by a letter to submit the planning study proposals. The RTC’s Executive Advisory Committee (EAC), Transportation Access Advisory Committee (TAAC), and Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee (MPS) are informed by placing an agenda to request planning activity proposal. Following the proposal submittal and compilation the EAC, TAAC, and MPS are consulted to finalize the UPWP. The final UPWP is then submitted for RTC adoption and approval from Federal Highway Administration.

**Planning Studies** identified in the UPWP often involve a degree of public involvement. While the details may vary from study to study, all such involvement is undertaken in accordance with the broad procedures outlined in the Public Participation Plan.

**Master Plan of Streets and Highway** (MPSH), the streets and highway division of the RTC maintains the MPSH and the capital improvement program (CIP). Any regionally significant projects funded under Motor Vehicle fuel Tax (MVFT) are included in the RTC TIP which is required to go through public process. Below is an excerpt from the “RTC Policies and Procedures” document describing the process to adopt the CIP.

1. The Regional Transportation Commission will maintain a Master Plan of Streets and Highways for the Las Vegas urban area. In order for a roadway project to be considered by the Regional Transportation Commission for funding under any program administered by the RTC, the roadway must be shown on this Master Plan of Streets and Highways.

2. In order to receive funding under any RTC program, the project must also be identified in the RTC Capital Improvement Program, as approved by the Regional Transportation Commission. Any project proposed for a roadway shown on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways may be submitted for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 2.1 and any specific requirements of the various CIP fund sources.

3. The Master Plan of Streets and Highways shall include all streets and highways that:
   a. Are included in a recognized transportation plan or transportation element adopted by one of the constituent entities of the RTC,
   b. Lie within the Las Vegas urban area; and,
c. Are identified as a street with a minimum of 80 feet planned right-of-way or functionally equivalent four (4) lane facility.

4. The Regional Transportation Commission may approve projects not included on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways, by waiver. If approved, the Board may then authorize the distribution of appropriate funds to the entity requesting the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Public Comment Period</th>
<th>Public Information Meeting/s</th>
<th>Public Meeting/s</th>
<th>Lead Department(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Four-Year Update</td>
<td>30-days. An additional seven days may be required if the 30-day period resulted in substantial changes - An additional 7-day public comment period is provided</td>
<td>Six public information meetings – including three in outlying areas.</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>21-days. An additional seven days may be required if the 21-day period resulted in substantial changes.</td>
<td>At least one public information meeting.</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>21-days. An additional seven days may be required if the 21-day period resulted in substantial changes.</td>
<td>At least one public information meeting.</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Comment period not required but may be undertaken at the discretion of the RTC. RTC adopted the TIP Administrative Modification and Amendment Process (Appendix B) laying out the process to follow in case of an amendment</td>
<td>Public information meeting not required but may be undertaken at the discretion of the RTC.</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>Administrative Modification</td>
<td>Comment period not required. RTC adopted the TIP Administrative Modification and Amendment Process laying out the process to follow in case of an Administrative Modification (Appendix B)</td>
<td>Public information meeting not required.</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td>Development and Amendment</td>
<td>No public comment period is required</td>
<td>Public information meeting not required.</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1, MPO Required Public Involvement Process Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Public Comment Period</th>
<th>Public Information Meeting/s</th>
<th>Public Meeting/s</th>
<th>Lead Department(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
<td>Development and Amendment</td>
<td>A 45-day comment period</td>
<td>At least one public information meeting.</td>
<td>No public meeting required - RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Studies</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>No public comment period is required</td>
<td>Public information meeting are not required, however, are arranged at the request of the agency(s).</td>
<td>No public meeting required - RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Planning will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>Development And Amendment</td>
<td>No public comment period is required</td>
<td>Public information meeting not required.</td>
<td>No public meeting required - RTC and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>MPO Streets and Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act Document</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>As required under NEPA process</td>
<td>As required under NEPA process</td>
<td>As required under NEPA process</td>
<td>MPO will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 RTC Transit

The transit department of the RTC is responsible to operate, maintain, and plan the RTC transit services in Southern Nevada. The RTC finance department manages the budget for the transit services and keeps the transit department informed of the revenues and funds for seamless transit operations. The transit department continually monitors the transit routes, collects, and analyzes ridership data to enhance transit service. Furthermore, the transit department coordinates with the Metropolitan Planning Department to monitor the population growth patterns within the service area. The changes in the population growth patterns may require changes in the transit services. The public is well informed about any changes in the transit services in accordance to the PPP. The changes in the schedule(s) and route(s) follow the Federal Transit Administration, Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements which are documented in the Transit Title VI report.

RTC Transit Documents

The following planning and programming documents are maintained by the RTC transit:

**Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (CPTHSTP)**

The Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan is a document that covers the regulations, services, needs, and programs associated with meeting the needs of the elderly and/or persons with disabilities. The plan is derived through a locally developed process that included members of the public, private and non-profit transportation providers, and human service agencies. The CPTHSTP guides the development of Transit Program of Projects funded by Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310) and Urbanized Area Formula Programs (Section 5307) in Southern Nevada.

**Transit Program of Projects (POP)**

The POP is a list of projects to be funded in a grant application submitted to FTA by a state or designated recipient. The program of projects (POP) lists the sub-recipients of the funds and indicates whether they are private, nonprofit agencies or local governmental authorities, designates the areas served (including rural areas), and identifies any tribal entities. In addition, the POP includes a brief description of the projects, total project cost, and federal share for each project, and the amount of funds used for program administration from the 10 percent allowed. The POP utilizes the RTP and TIP development, amendment, and modification process to inform public of the new POP or any changes.

**Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)**

The Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) identifies and analyzes the transit capital and operational needs of the Las Vegas region for the next five to ten years. The SRTP is presented to the RTC Board for review and approval.

**Table-2** details the standard public participation procedures for the transit documents and services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/Service</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Public Comment Period</th>
<th>Public Information Meeting/s</th>
<th>Public Meeting/s</th>
<th>Lead Department/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Program of Projects (POP)</td>
<td>Development of new POP</td>
<td>These actions will be coordinated with the MPO planning department’s TIP process identified in table # 1</td>
<td>These actions will be coordinated with the MPO planning department’s TIP process identified in table #1</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC, TAAC, and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>Finance/Transit will lead and inform MPO Planning. MPO will coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services</td>
<td>Development of new Plan</td>
<td>A 21 day public comment period</td>
<td>At least one public information meeting</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC, TAAC, and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>Transit will lead and coordinate with MPO and Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>A 21 day public comment period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes/Update</td>
<td>A 21 day public comment period</td>
<td>At least one public meeting</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC, TAAC, and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document. May schedule additional meetings as needed</td>
<td>Finance/Transit will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Transit Route Changes</td>
<td>Route removal</td>
<td>A 30 day public comment period</td>
<td>At least three public information meetings</td>
<td>Public hearings are conducted at the regularly scheduled RTC Board and TAAC meetings May schedule additional meetings as needed</td>
<td>Finance/Transit will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route alteration</td>
<td>A 30 day public comment period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Route</td>
<td>A 30 day public comment period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fare change</td>
<td>A 60 day public comment period</td>
<td>At least three public information meetings</td>
<td>Public meetings are conducted at the regularly scheduled RTC Board and TAAC meetings May schedule additional hearings as needed</td>
<td>Finance/Transit will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route and or Demand Response/Paratransit</td>
<td>Development, amendment, and modification</td>
<td>No public comment period required</td>
<td>No public information meeting required</td>
<td>No public meeting required – RTC, TAAC, and EAC meetings are open to public where the public can comment on this document.</td>
<td>Finance/Transit will lead and coordinate with Government Affairs to plan public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Range Transit Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Public Involvement Techniques

The RTC utilizes several methods to reach out to public and inform them about RTC activities. The RTC Government Affairs Department coordinates with the other RTC divisions and reviews the service, plan, or study that requires public involvement and then devises a public involvement strategy from the following tools.

**Public Information Meetings** are conducted to inform the public about a specific RTC service, planning and programing document. The public is encouraged to attend the meetings and provide input. A court reporter is available at these meetings to record public comments. The comments received are compiled and presented to the decision makers.

**Public Hearings** are usually held as a part of regularly scheduled RTC committees, so the public can voice their opinion regarding plans, programs, documents, or any other services provided by the RTC. The comments from the public are recorded and reviewed before making any decisions. A court reporter is available to record public comments.

**Public Workshops** are conducted to inform public on a regional planning or a topic of interest. Interested parties and individuals are identified for participation and are informed through mail, media, and other selected notification methods. The workshop increases the community awareness and involvement.

**Focus Group/Planning Charrettes** are organized to build consensus, recommendations, and a vision for the RTC plans and studies. All interested parties are invited to a charrette to collect their views which are documented and presented to the appropriate RTC committees before making any decisions.

**Special Events** are created to announce and highlight or kick-off its outreach about an issue, project, initiative or news event. The RTC generally publicizes special events through media, the RTC website or direct mail.
Open Houses may provide meetings/tours/receptions specific to locations that interest the public, in order to highlight an initiative, project or facility.

Key Person Interviews: RTC members or employees may meet individually with designated stakeholder opinion leaders, such as Chamber officials or members, mayors, advisory body members, nonprofit agency representatives, education representatives, religious leaders, business owners or individual constituents potentially impacted by a RTC decision and get feedback.

Civic and Community Meetings are held to provide updates to City Councils, County Commissioners, Town Boards and other elected bodies, and speakers on topics of interest to groups hosting meetings in the region. The RTC representatives establish relationships with host organizations and may attend the organization’s meetings and events.

Multi-lingual Communication: Planning or project areas are analyzed for their demographic character before the start of the public outreach which helps RTC in selecting the appropriate medium and methods to get public input. This may include translation of documents or participation of bilingual staff at RTC events.

Public Presentation and Visualization

RTC provides a variety of accessible information resources to help participants understand competing proposals, impacts and possible outcomes related to complex regional transportation projects and plans. Visualization techniques used to illustrate these issues may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following materials and practices:

- Aerial photographs or with mapping overlays
- Photo simulations of proposed projects
- Photographs of existing projects comparable to those proposed
- Interactive maps that allow comparison of proposals
- Interactive maps that allow addition/subtraction of proposed elements
- Printed, three-dimensional, or raised print maps, diagrams, or architectural figures
- “Before” and “After” photos, simulations, maps, diagrams or drawings
- Scenario planning exercises
Figure 5 - Public Meeting Utilizing Aerials Photos to Inform Public

Notification Methods

All RTC public notices are published in the major English, Spanish, and Chinese newspapers in the Las Vegas Valley. The following additional notification methods may be utilized in reaching out to the public in the best manner:

- Newsletters
- Mailing Lists
- Direct Mail
- Ethnic Media
- Paid Advertisements
- Flyer Distribution to Community Based Organizations
- Flyer Distribution at Bus Stations
- Offices of city and county elected officials

Survey Methods

- Online surveys
- Phone surveys
- Mail surveys

It is noted that surveys may or may not be statistically valid depending on the nature of the project.

8 Additional Media

Website

The RTC website, www.rtcsnv.com, is another outlet for citizens to give and receive information. The plans, programs, studies, and public notices are posted and available on the website for review and download.

The website is updated on a constant basis with the most current and relevant information related to the RTC. Bus passes may be purchased online, transit trips may be planned, and the user can sign up for services, download plans or agendas, or contact the agency via several online forms and portals. Public notices are posted on the main web page under the news and information tab to bring immediate attention to publically relevant topics or meetings.
Social Media

The RTC utilizes the latest social media technology, such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube to bring attention to transportation issues and upcoming RTC events instantaneously.

Television and Radio

The RTC maintains communication with local and national media through various means, including media advisories, press releases, reporter and editorial briefings, and informal communication. Commission meetings are also broadcast on Clark County Television (CCTV) Channel 4.

Special Events

The RTC also participates and sponsors several community events each year to assist in promoting and educating the general public regarding all forms of transportation.

9 Public Participation Plan Potential Evaluation Measures

It is one of the RTC’s objectives to involve the public in a timely manner to make informed decisions for providing an efficient, safe, and economical transportation system for all modes. Effective public outreach increases the public participation. The PPP is a living document which can be updated anytime the RTC sees a need to enhance public participation. The PPP document is scheduled to be evaluated for its effectiveness every four years and updates are processed accordingly.

The RTC utilizes different mediums which are discussed in the previous section to reach out to the public. For the purposes of evaluating the PPP, the RTC will be considering the following to track public participation:

- **Facebook and Twitter:** The monitoring of social media accounts provides the RTC valuable input to evaluate public participation and enhance messaging by using simple language.

- **Website:** The RTC website is reviewed annually for accessibility and ease of use. The number of visits to the website can be tracked to determine its effectiveness. It can be enhanced by providing the RTC web address on printed, electronic media, and giveaways.

- **Press Releases:** The RTC can inform media and the public through the distribution of press releases on significant RTC activity such as public meetings, hearings and special events. The amount of coverage in the media can be tracked to determine its effectiveness.

- **Planning Document Distribution:** The RTC can increase the number of distribution sites and build a distribution list, to include county and city government buildings and libraries. This measure will be evaluated by the number of distribution sites.

- **Outreach Events:** The RTC participates in community outreach events to enhance public participation. RTC display booths at community events provide information about upcoming MPO initiatives.
10 2017-2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

The RTC will follow the adopted PPP process for an early public involvement in the development of RTP. Public notices in the widely circulated newspapers will be published and social and other electronic media will be utilized as needed. Public meetings will be conducted throughout the Las Vegas Valley and in the outskirts of the Metropolitan Planning Area. The public comments and response to the comments will be documented and attached in the RTP appendices sections of the public participation plan.

The tentative timeline for the development of the next RTP is as follows:

Summer 2015 - Inform the agencies and call for projects

Fall 2015 - Complete Air Quality Modelling

Winter 2015 - RTP Document Development

Summer 2016 - RTP public comments

Winter 2016 - Finalize RTP and submit for approval

Appendix

Appendix A: Appendix will identify and document the public participation outreach activities for the next 2017-2040 RTP.

Appendix B: Transportation Improvement Program Amendment and Administrative Modification Process

Appendix C: RTC Title VI Policy
Appendix A: Appendix, Public participation Outreach Activities

for the Next 2017-2040 RTP

(Pending)
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Administrative Modification and Amendment Process

November 14, 2007
Background

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is updated at least every four years in coordination with the area agencies and incorporated into the Nevada’s Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As the projects in the TIP and STIP move close to implementation stage, they require changes on a regular basis. The following are the internal procedures of the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) to modify and amend the TIP and STIP to reflect changing regional needs and to streamline the project delivery system.

NDOT has adopted two processes for administrative modifications and amendments, as set out in Figures 2 and 4 of the Statewide Transportation System Projects (TSP) For Fiscal Years 2008-2017, October 2007. The RTC accepts the process outlined in the TSP. However, this process needs to be expanded to define and meet the RTC internal procedures as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Clark County.

NDOT and RTC Administrative Modification and Amendment Process Hierarchy – Figure A
NDOT Administrative Modification Process As Per NDOT Statewide Transportation System Projects (TSP)

**Applies:**
1. When there is a change in a public funding category with no change in the priority of a project in the STIP/RTIP.
2. When a project is moved from the third or fourth to the first or second year or a project is moved from the second to the first of the STIP/RTIP. (Project to be completed sooner/Project is moved forward)
3. When moving a project from the first to the second, third or fourth year of the STIP/RTIP or moving a project from the second or third year to the fourth year. (Project is completed later/Project is moved back.)
4. When a positive cost estimate change is less than $5 Million is requested/anticipated.
5. When a positive cost estimate change is requested/anticipated that is greater than $5 Million, but less than 20 percent of the estimated dollar amount of the project.
6. When a positive or negative change in the un-programmed balance forward is received.
7. When a positive or negative change in the anticipated fund allocation is received.
8. When a project is added to use Federal Funds for repayment of previously authorized work and all repayments will come from unallocated funds.
9. When a new planning study is identified.
10. When a project is Advance Constructed.

The following procedures are followed by the RTC in response to the administrative modification process initiated by NDOT.

1. **Minor TIP/STIP Administrative Modifications**
   These are defined by items 5-8 and 10 of the NDOT administrative modification process as set out above (See Figure B):

   RTC staff will adjust the TIP upon receipt of NODT notification, and will notify the RTC Board of the adjustment.
   
   i) RTC staff adjust the TIP upon receipt of NDOT notification.
   ii) Executive Advisory Committee (EAC) notified of administrative modification on consent agenda.
   iii) No formal RTC Board action required.

2. **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment**
   These are defined by item 9 of the NDOT administrative modification process.
   i) New NDOT planning studies are included in the UPWP and follow the established UPWP approval/amendment process.
3. TIP/STIP Administrative Modifications
These are defined by items 1-4 of the NDOT administrative modification process as set out on Page 3 (See Figure B):

i) RTC staff (Assistant Planning Manager) issue a memo of concurrence unless circumstances require elevation.
ii) EAC notified of concurrence on consent agenda.
iii) No formal RTC Board action required

NDOT TIP/STIP Administrative Modification Procedures Initiated by NDOT – Figure B

TIP and STIP administrative modifications do not require RTC Board action. The RTC authorizes the General Manager or his designee to approve administrative modifications requested by NDOT and sponsoring agencies. However, the RTC will be informed of the TIP adjustments by consent agenda.

The following procedures are followed by the RTC staff when the administrative modification process is initiated by RTC.

4. Minor TIP/STIP Administrative Modifications
These are defined by items 5-8 and 10 of the NDOT administrative modification process as set out on Page 3 (See Figure C):

i) RTC staff (Assistant Planning Manager) adjust the TIP and request NDOT to make corresponding administrative modification to the STIP.
ii) EAC notified on consent agenda.
iii) No formal RTC Board action required
5. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment
These are defined by item 9 of the NDOT administrative modification process as set out on Page 3:

i) New RTC planning studies are included in the UPWP and follow the established UPWP approval/amendment process.

6. TIP/STIP Administrative Modifications
These are defined by items 1-4 of the NDOT administrative modification process as set out on Page 3 (See Figure C):

i) RTC staff (Assistant Planning Manager) adjust the TIP and request NDOT to make corresponding administrative modification to the STIP.

ii) EAC notified on consent agenda.

iii) No formal RTC Board action required

RTC TIP/STIP Administrative Modification Procedures Initiated by RTC – Figure C

TIP and STIP administrative modifications do not require RTC Board action. The RTC authorizes the General Manager or his designee to initiate TIP administrative modifications on behalf of the RTC and to forward such modifications to NDOT for incorporation into the STIP. The RTC will be informed of such TIP modifications by consent agenda.
NDOT Amendment Process As Per NDOT Statewide Transportation System Projects (TSP)

Applies:
1. When there is a significant change in the design or scope of any project identified in the STIP/RTIP.
2. When a regionally significant project is added or deleted.
3. When there are changes in the funding category that alter the overall financial reasonableness of the STIP/RTIP, or when a privately funded project is changed to public funding.
4. When there is a positive change in cost over $5 Million and greater than 20 percent of the estimated dollar amount of the project is requested /anticipated.

The following procedures are followed by RTC in response to the NDOT amendment process. When RTC initiates the amendment process, RTC staff inform NDOT of the intention to request an amendment and then follow the procedures identified below.

7. TIP/STIP Administrative Amendments for “Exempt” Projects

This applies to actions that involve only “Exempt” activities as defined in 40 CFR Part 93 (See Figure D):

As shown in Figure D, slightly different procedures are followed for actions involving amendments to funding, for the addition/deletion of “exempt” projects, or for actions affecting fiscal constraint:

For changes in funding sources or funding amounts that exceed the limits of an adjustment as set out on Page 3 but do not call into question the overall fiscal balance of the TIP program:
   i) NDOT, RTC or a sponsoring agency requests an administrative amendment to the TIP
   ii) RTC staff confirm “exempt” status and that there is no effect on fiscal constraint
   iii) RTC staff amend the TIP and request NDOT to make corresponding amendment to the STIP.
   iv) EAC notified on consent agenda.
   v) No formal RTC Board action required

For changes in funding amounts that potentially affect the overall fiscal balance of the TIP program:
   i) NDOT, RTC or a sponsoring agency requests an administrative amendment to the TIP
   ii) RTC staff prepare a statement confirming the amendment is consistent with fiscal constraint
   iii) EAC notified on non-consent
   iv) RTC Board approves the amendment and requests NDOT to make corresponding amendment to STIP for FHWA approval
For changes that add, delete or change the scope of projects require RTC Board action:

i) NDOT, RTC or a sponsoring agency requests an administrative amendment to the TIP
ii) RTC staff confirm “exempt” status
iii) EAC notified on non-consent
iv) RTC Board approves the amendment and requests NDOT to make corresponding amendment to STIP for FHWA approval

Note: The administrative amendment does not come into effect until NDOT has incorporated the amendment into STIP and FHWA has approved the STIP amendment.

RTC - TIP/STIP Administrative Amendment Procedures for Exempt Activities– Figure D

* Staff – Director of Planning Services

For TIP administrative amendments that do not require RTC Board action, the RTC authorizes the General Manager or his designee to approve these amendments. However, the RTC will be informed of these administrative amendments by consent agenda.
8. TIP/STIP amendments approved on the basis of a conformity statement

8.1 “Non-Regionally Significant” Amendments

This applies to non-exempt activities that do not involve the following (see Figure E):
   a) the design concept, scope or alignment of Regionally Significant projects,
   b) the horizon year completion date of Regionally Significant projects, or
   c) the implementation of Transportation Control Measures identified in the SIPs.

To expedite program delivery, RTC will in certain cases approve a TIP amendment based on a conformity statement that the proposed amendment will have such minimal effect on emissions that a full conformity analysis is not warranted. RTC staff will determine on a case-by-case basis if the proposed amendment requires a conformity statement or a new conformity analysis. RTC will consult with NDOT and FHWA together or separately as appropriate in making this determination.

8.2 “External” TIP/STIP amendments

This applies to actions that affect the design concept, scope or alignment of Regionally Significant projects that are outside the area included in the travel demand forecast model network, but are within an air quality non-attainment area (see Figure E):

i) NDOT, RTC or a sponsoring agency requests an amendment to the TIP
ii) RTC staff prepares a conformity statement justifying why the existing conformity finding is not affected by the proposed amendment. In the case of “external” projects, estimates of VMT and emissions will be developed in conjunction with NDOT using methods consistent with those approved by the FHWA for the RTP conformity finding.
iii) RTC will hold a 21 day public notification and comment period.
iv) EAC recommends adoption of amendment.
v) RTC Board approves the amendment and requests NDOT to make corresponding amendment to STIP for FHWA approval

RTC - TIP/STIP Amendment Procedures Requiring Conformity Statement – Figure E
9. **TIP/STIP Amendments requiring conformity analysis**

Applies to actions that involve the following (See Figure F):

a) Addition/deletion of Regionally Significant Projects.
b) Change the design concept, scope or alignment of Regionally Significant projects included in the modeled conformity analysis.
c) Change the horizon year completion date of Regionally Significant projects.
d) Change the implementation of Transportation Control Measures identified in the SIPs.

i) NDOT, RTC or a sponsoring agency requests an amendment to the TIP.
ii) RTC staff prepares a conformity analysis and makes a conformity determination after consulting with other agencies.
iii) RTC holds a 30-day public notification and comment period, including a public meeting.
iv) EAC recommends adoption of amendment.
v) RTC Board approves the amendment and requests NDOT to make corresponding amendment to STIP for FHWA approval.

**NOTES:**
1. The amendment or administrative amendment does not come into effect until NDOT has incorporated the amendment into STIP and FHWA has approved the STIP amendment.
2. It may take 16-24 weeks from the time a request is received by RTC to process an amendment request requiring conformity analysis.

**RTC – TIP/STIP Amendment Procedures Requiring Conformity – Figure F**
Acronyms

RTC – Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
NDOT – Nevada Department of Transportation
FHWA – Federal Highway Administration
EAC – Executive Advisory Committee
RTP – Regional Transportation Plan
TIP – Transportation Improvement Program
RTIP – Regional Transportation Improvement Program
STIP – Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TSP – Statewide Transportation System Projects
SIP – State Implementation Plan
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The content of this appendix is located here:

MINUTES
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
JUNE 13, 2019

These minutes are prepared in compliance with NRS 241.035. Text is in summarized rather than verbatim format. For complete contents, please refer to meeting recordings on file at the Regional Transportation Commission.

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON JUNE 6, 2019

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Larry Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Clark County Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Larry Brown, Chair, Clark County
Debra March, Vice-Chair, City of Henderson
Isaac Barron, City of North Las Vegas
George Gault, City of Mesquite
Carolyn Goodman, City of Las Vegas
Kristina Swallow, Nevada Department of Transportation (ex-officio)
Lois Tarkanian, City of Las Vegas
Rod Woodbury, City of Boulder City

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Jim Gibson, Clark County

RTC STAFF:
Tina Quigley, Chief Executive Officer
Fred Ohene, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
M.J. Maynard, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Greg Gilbert, Outside Legal Counsel
David Swallow, Chief Engineering and Technology Officer
Marc Traasdahl, Chief Financial Officer
Angela Castro, Chief Strategy, Policy, and Marketing Officer
John Peñuelas, Jr., Director of Engineering Services – Streets and Highways
Aileen Magnera, Advertising and Creative Supervisor
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

INTERESTED PARTIES:
Patricia Anderson
Jane Camburn, Helping Hands of Henderson
Remikya Davis
Linda Johnson-Sanders
Carolyn Pelletier, Helping Hands of Vegas Valley
Lisa Popovsky, Jewish Family Service
Julian Serrano, Opportunity Village
Amanda Shipp, Easterseals Nevada

RTC Item #6
July 11, 2019
Consent
**38.** RECEIVE NOTIFICATION THAT THE MONTHLY CAPITAL PROJECT TRACKING REPORT AND THE UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM PROJECT ACTIVITY STATUS REPORT HAVE BEEN POSTED TO THE RTC’S WEBSITE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**39.** APPROVE THE 2019 METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION REPORT UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**40.** APPROVE AND AUTHORIZE AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF HENDERSON FOR THE LIVABLE CENTER AT GALLERIA, LIVABLE CENTERS STUDY PROGRAM PHASE II (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**41.** APPROVE AMENDMENT CLARK 19-12 TO THE 2017-2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**42.** APPROVE AMENDMENT CLARK 19-13 TO THE 2017-2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**43.** APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-046-1, RTC COMMUNITY MOBILITY PROJECT – HELPING HANDS OF HENDERSON, WITH DIGNITY HEALTH ST. ROSE DOMINICAN HOSPITALS FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $92,100.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**44.** APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-046-2, RTC COMMUNITY MOBILITY PROJECT – JOB ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE, WITH EASTER SEALS NEVADA FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $38,629.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**45.** APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-046-3, RTC COMMUNITY MOBILITY PROJECT – COORDINATED SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, WITH HELPING HANDS OF VEGAS VALLEY, INC. FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $251,963.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**46.** APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-046-4, RTC COMMUNITY MOBILITY PROJECT – LAS VEGAS SENIOR LIFELINE TRANSPORTATION, WITH JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $43,770.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**47.** APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-046-5, RTC COMMUNITY MOBILITY PROJECT – SENIOR/DISABLED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES, WITH LEND A HAND BOULDER CITY FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $44,638.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**48.** APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 19-046-6, RTC COMMUNITY MOBILITY PROJECT – COMMUNITY OUTINGS AND WORK READINESS PROGRAM, WITH OPPORTUNITY VILLAGE ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS (ARC), FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $294,100.00, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**49.** APPROVE THE AWARD OF BID NO. 19-047, FAST TRAFFIC SIGNAL EQUIPMENT, REPAIR, AND MAINTENANCE, TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, TRANSCORE ITS, LLC, IN THE AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $415,000.00 FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, WITH TWO (2) ONE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTIONS, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONTRACT OR TAKE OTHER ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**50.** APPROVE THE AWARD OF BID NO. 19-054, PRINTING OF ENCODED TICKET STOCK
ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS CONTRACT (ARC) PROCUREMENT, TO THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, ELECTRONIC DATA MAGNETICS, INC., FROM NOTICE TO PROCEED THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, IN THE AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $53,720.00, WITH FOUR (4) ONE-YEAR OPTIONS, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONTRACT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**51.** RECEIVE A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE TO SELECT AND AWARD CONTRACT NO. 19-055, FREEWAY AND ARTERIAL SYSTEM OF TRANSPORTATION (FAST) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES, TO GCW, INC. IN THE AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $150,000.00 FROM NOTICE TO PROCEED THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, WITH TWO (2) ONE-YEAR OPTIONS, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONTRACT; OR TAKE OTHER ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**52.** RECEIVE A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE TO SELECT AND AWARD CONTRACT NO. 19-056, MEDIA AND PUBLIC RELATIONS, TO FFM, L.L.C. DBA FAISS FOLEY WARREN PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS (FFW) IN THE AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED $100,000.00 FROM JULY 1, 2019 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2020, WITH TWO ONE-YEAR OPTIONS TO RENEW, AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONTRACT; OR TAKE OTHER ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**53.** APPROVE, ADOPT AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN RESOLUTION 571 FOR DONATION OF EQUIPMENT TO LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, A GOVERNMENT ENTITY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**54.** APPROVE AND ADOPT RESOLUTION NUMBER 572 TO AUGMENT THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (2) IN THE AMOUNT OF $2,800,219.00 AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE TO FORWARD THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO THE STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**55.** APPROVE THE CONFIRMATION OF COVERAGE WITH CRAGIN & PIKE TO ACT AS THE BROKER TO SECURE COVERAGE WITH TRAVELERS INSURANCE, ARGONAUT INSURANCE, HALLMARK INSURANCE, WCF/ADVANTAGE, ONEBEACON, HISCOX INSURANCE, AND FEDERAL INSURANCE THROUGH THE BROKER CRAGIN & PIKE FOR THE RTC’S GENERAL LIABILITY, AUTOMOBILE, EXCESS LIABILITY, WORKERS’ COMPENSATION, CYBER LIABILITY, EMPLOYED LAWYERS, PUBLIC OFFICIALS DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LIABILITY INSURANCE; AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE CONFIRMATION OF COVERAGE LETTER (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**56.** APPROVE THE 2019 RTC TRANSIT PROGRAM REPORT UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

*Comments:*
No comments were made.

*Motion:*
Vice-Chair Debra March made a motion to approve the agenda.

*Vote/Summary:*
7 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.
Ayes: Larry Brown, Isaac Barron, George Gault, Carolyn Goodman, Debra March, Lois Tarkanian, Rod Woodbury
Nays: None
Absent: Jim Gibson